THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

It is a pleasure to welcome the first of the theological publications of the Edinburgh University Press. The work in question is entitled *New Birth : A Study of the Evangelical Doctrine of Conversion in the Protestant Fathers.*[1] The author, the Rev. Bernhard Citron, Ph.D., explains that he is the son of Jewish parents, and was brought up in the comfortable atmosphere of religious toleration, humanitarian ideals, and appreciation of science and art. The beginning of the Nazi régime shattered this optimistic outlook, and during years of exile after the autumn of 1933 the author was brought to a spiritual crisis and eventually became a Christian. Trained for the Presbyterian ministry in New College, Edinburgh, Dr. Citron made a close study of the writings of Luther, Calvin, Melanchthon, Wesley, and others, and has embodied the results of his investigations in the present work.

With such an origin the book is bound to be interesting. As Principal Hugh Watt points out in a short Preface, the work is no mere compendium of the opinions of other men assembled from the point of view of one tradition. 'Dr. Citron,' he writes, 'was reared in none of them ; and there is a freshness in his approach to each, and a catholicity of sympathy with the best points in all which add greatly to the value of his treatment.' How great is the distance Dr. Citron has travelled in his spiritual pilgrimage is shown in his words about the period when he was a bank clerk and afterwards a journalist in Germany : 'If any one had asked me in those days what I understood by the term "conversion," I would have answered without the slightest hesitation : "Conversion is the exchange of a loan or bond for another one, at a lower rate of interest." '

The time is certainly ripe for a fresh study of the New Birth from a Biblical and historical angle. We have had several important investigations from the psychological point of view. Dr. Citron claims that it is impossible to find a psychological explanation of this doctrine, since psychology cannot take account of the source and the purpose of the New Birth. In this connexion he effectively quotes the opinion of Carl Gustav Jung : 'The dogma represents the soul more completely than a scientific theory, for the latter expresses and formulates the conscious mind alone. Furthermore, a theory can do nothing but formulate a living thing by abstract notions. The dogma, on the contrary, expresses aptly the living process of the unconscious in the form of the drama of repentance, sacrifice, redemption (*Psychology and Religion*, 57).'

Perhaps the greatest need of Christian exposition concerning the New Birth at the present time is to see the doctrine in relation to the Christian life as a whole. Dr. Citron meets this need, for he traces the progress of the converted soul from the darkness of pre-conversion days to life eternal. The first two chapters form a double prologue. 'Almost unconsciously,' he says, 'I borrowed that idea from a work that was my companion, bedside book, and almost "Bible," before I became a Christian. Goethe's *Faust* begins with a "Vorspiel auf dem Theater" (Prologue on the Stage) and a Prologue in Heaven. In my first chapter, "*Take read . . .*," the stage is set : the whole scenario is the Word of God.' 'In "Prologue in Heaven" the distinctive parts played by the three Persons of the Holy Trinity in the conversion of man are explained.' To peep into God's worship, the author recognizes, may appear to be presumptuous, but it is still more presumptuous, he says, to think of conversion as made in our own workshops. 'Conversion begins on God's and not on man's initiative.'

After the Prologues a long section follows entitled 'Pilgrimage,' which is descriptive of the various stages in a typical religious experience. Striking titles introduce each separate theme, together with apt quotations from prose and poetry. 'Before Dawn' treats the state of the unconverted and the not-yet converted : and 'On the Road to Damascus' faces the question of sudden and gradual conversion. Then follow valuable chapters on Vocation, the Elements of Conversion, Baptism, the Marks of the New Birth, the Lifelong Struggle, Assurance, and Union with Christ. An 'Epilogue' discusses Life Everlasting, introduced by the challenging comment, 'We have

[1] 21s. net.

reached the last stages of conversion.' It may be doubted if so comprehensive a programme has been followed before, or if a work of this kind has ever been published by a distinguished University Press.

We have space only to describe with any fullness the sixth chapter, which treats 'The Elements of Conversion.' There are undoubtedly differences of emphasis within Protestant theology, as may be seen, for example, in the place Luther gave to faith, Calvin to repentance, and Melanchthon to the renewal of the will. Conversion is pre-eminently a faith-experience, especially if it is viewed in terms of Emil Brunner's definition: 'Faith is not only knowing God and the Self (*notitia*), it is not only an assent and a resolve to live no longer in self-dependence but in God-dependence (*assensus*), it is also feeling the certainty and joyfulness of belonging to God which lifts us above the abyss of absolute terror (*fiducia*).' In such an understanding of faith there is room also for repentance, which admittedly, as Calvin taught, is deepened as faith grows and is enriched. To what degree the will is involved must probably always be variously estimated, for the Synergist controversy is by no means dead, but provided it is allowed that the will, although in bondage through sin, is renewed in conversion by the power of the Holy Spirit, there is every reason why regeneration should not be interpreted as a purely passive experience.

We add a few *obiter dicta* from this notable work. 'In the whole of Biblical history there is not a single example of a man who, before he is called, finds God by seeking Him.' 'There is no such thing as conversion to Christianity, but only conversion to Christ.' 'The chief characteristic of unconverted man is not merely that he dwells in darkness, but that he flees the light.' 'Effectual calling is not an act, which is done in one moment, but a work of God which requires more time and "is made up of sundry acts"' (John Brown). 'Assurance is . . . grounded on the work of Christ, is achieved by the Holy Ghost, and is communicated to us by faith.' 'We are incapable of receiving Christ, unless we are emptied and come with open mouth to receive His grace' (John Calvin). 'It is the task of Christian doctrine to establish the truth of conversion, and the aim of the Evangelical ministry to proclaim the urgency of the new birth, "that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."'

There has recently appeared a posthumous volume by the late Rev. John Kenneth MOZLEY, D.D., entitled *Some Tendencies in British Theology*.[1]

[1] S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net.

It is a critical survey of British Theology from the publication of 'Lux Mundi' to the present day. Unfortunately it is not a fully comprehensive survey, nor does it bring the subject up to date, for Dr. MOZLEY died before he had examined all the 'tendencies' or covered all the years between 1889 and his own death.

It is a volume of much usefulness and value, coming as it does from the pen of an able and discerning theologian, to whom many are indebted for his works on the Atonement, Divine Impassibility, and the Beginnings of Christian Theology. The older readers of the volume will be glad to be enabled to cast their eyes back on the course they themselves have travelled in the last generation or more and to see the signposts more clearly than they did while discussion and controversy ran high. The younger readers will be provided with a background to the discussions in which they are now engaged that should help to direct their course and sharpen their awareness of its tendency.

The spirit in which Dr. MOZLEY writes is one of detachment combined with sympathy, and one cannot but admire the wisdom and insight, the tolerance and catholicity of outlook, the book displays; not to speak of its wide grasp of theological problems. In one place he says: 'Men do not always differ as much as they think they do; that applies to theologians as well as to the rest of mankind, and it is possible to over-estimate through long convention both the depth and the significance of theological disagreements.'

Nearly two-thirds of the book before us is devoted to the tendencies of theology in England. Stress is laid on the influence of such men as Pusey and Gore, W. R. Inge and von Hügel, P. T. Forsyth and Hoskyns. It is observed that the typical English theology is continuously sensitive to philosophical inquiries and in this presents a contrast to the Barthian school. And it is added that a small library of nine books by three recent Church of England theologians would suffice for a very thorough grounding in philosophy of religion and dogmatics.

'A castaway upon a desert island would find most of his needs met had he been able to save from his ship the following volumes: by Dr. Temple, *Mens Creatrix* (1917), *Christus Veritas* (1924), and *Nature, Man and God* (1934); by Dr. Matthews, *God in Christian Thought and Experience* (1930), *Essays in Construction* (1933), and *The Purpose of God* (1935); by Dr. Quick, *The Ground of Faith and the Chaos of Thought* (1931), *The*

Christian Sacraments (1927), and *Doctrines of the Creed* (1938).'

Generous space is given to the theological scene as it reveals itself in Scotland as compared with England in the period under review, and one great difference is noted. Whereas in England theological developments have had their place within a changing ecclesiastical system, the nature of the theological tradition in Scottish Presbyterianism has been unmistakable, and has not been the subject of controversial discussion as a ground of debate within the Church. The point may not be obvious as thus stated, but Dr. MOZLEY goes on to remark that two great debates, and only two, have divided Scottish churchmen in the last century. The first referred to questions concerning Establishment, and took its start in the events that led to the Disruption of 1843. The second was the consideration of the issues raised by the Higher Criticism, which culminated in the removal of W. Robertson Smith from his Professorial Chair, though no decision in principle against liberty of criticism appears to have been made by the Free Church.

In this part of the work the names that fill the pages are those of A. B. Bruce, Robert Flint, the Cairds, James Orr, James Denney, George Galloway, H. R. Mackintosh, W. P. Paterson, and D. S. Cairns—names of the past, not of the present. It is because the scholars and theologians of Scotland have, generally speaking, been undisturbed by the ' excursions and alarums ' which their southern confreres have often been unable to ignore that the approach to Scottish theology is made here by way of particular theologians.

When Dr. MOZLEY turns to the present, he pays most attention to the writings of Dr. John Baillie. It is to be said, however, that the reference is to his earliest writings, and his later and more characteristic writings (by which he would probably prefer to be judged) are not included in this survey.

By way of postscript comes a brief account of the work, not of Professors in the universities or colleges of Scotland, but of the Professors of Westminster College, Cambridge, ' a college not in Scotland, but surely of Scotland.' Oman's ' Grace and Personality ' (1917) is characterized as sufficient to place the writer among the most penetrating religious thinkers of his generation. ' Easy he is not ; nor is he always lucid ; but he is always going down to the roots of the matter, and he is the enemy *à outrance* of anything that seems to him unreal.'

The Mind of Christ

VI. The Rule of the Father

BY THE REVEREND W. H. CADMAN, M.A., D.THEOL., PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL STUDIES IN MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD

IN a short article on a subject of this magnitude a summary manner of writing can hardly be avoided. Leave is here taken to say without discussion that to speak believingly of the βασιλεία of God in the New Testament sense of the term is to imply that this human life of ours, marked throughout its history by evil in its various forms, by ignorance, by suffering, and worst of all by that inward corruption which is sin, has been the scene of a long redemptive work of God ; and it is to acknowledge that in the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ this action of God came to a climax from which in His purpose was to result a Community existing in the perfection of fellowship with Him for ever. This Community is in process of creation in the Church, where its membership is being made up and its joys anticipated.

What more definitely was the character of the βασιλεία in the sense of the Divine eschatological action which was accomplished in Jesus ? Among His traditional utterances which bear directly upon this question a leading place belongs to the two Parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin in Lk $15^{3ff.}$ (cf. Mt $18^{12ff.}$). They show that He was aware of the release of a new energy of the love of God set upon redeeming the ' lost.' It was not enough that He should say in effect : ' Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near : let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts : and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him ; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon ' (Is $55^{6f.}$). Such a passage as this, and the many others like it which might be cited from

Israel's prophets, the literature of later Judaism and the Rabbis, do not disclose the full measure of the Divine goodness lying open to the consciousness of Jesus. The two Parables and His dealings with the 'lost' reveal that the *βασιλεία* presented itself to Him as the exercise of a goodness in God which did not wait for the repentance of its objects, was not called forth by any deserving of their own, but, on the contrary, was conditioned on their side by the extremity of their situation (cf. the Parable of the Two Debtors [Lk $7^{40ff.}$]).

However, if to the mind of Jesus it now counted for nothing that the objects of the Divine action were unworthy of it, that did not mean that membership of the *βασιλεία*, regarded as the Divine Community, for the formation of which the *βασιλεία*, in the sense so far under consideration, had come with Himself and His ministry, was to be had for nothing. To the present *βασιλεία* response had to be made. Hence the existence of an ethical teaching of Jesus—an ethic of the required response.

The evidence provided by the Synoptic Gospels for the ethic of response is not all of one sort. In some traditional sayings of Jesus certain inward qualities are extolled; in others a demand is made for unqualified obedience to the will of God and conformity with His own goodness as known to Jesus Himself and manifested by Him. Thus (to notice first some instances of the former type of saying) a child's acceptance of the state of dependence in which it has to live, and its reliance upon the loving care of others, represent a necessary attitude towards the *βασιλεία* of the present (Mk $10^{13ff.}$, Mt $19^{13ff.}$, Lk $18^{15ff.}$; cf. Mt $18^{1ff.}$). Again, humility, contrition, and trust in God are responses to it and signs that the 'poor in spirit' (Mt 5^{3})—who are described in this way because they have these qualities—are destined for the complete felicity of the Divine Community. Once more, how happy (cf. Mt $7^{7f.}$, Lk $11^{9f.}$) is to be the lot of those who respond to the present *βασιλεία* with 'hunger and thirst after righteousness' (Mt 5^{6}, where the Matthaean sense of 'righteousness' is to be gathered from 5^{21} to the end of The Sermon).

Besides approving and lauding the qualities concerned in such sayings as the foregoing, Jesus in other utterances about response demands from His hearers willingness to renounce the present order and the ethos which clings to it and to hold fast only and wholly to God now more wonderfully and yet more fatefully near to men than ever before. It was not that in His eyes the present Age was evil through and through. In His task of awakening and intensifying response to the *βασιλεία* as now come with Himself He was in the habit of using similes drawn from the realm of familiar human experience without any apparent misgiving. Nevertheless the present order was one which could not last on. Let any one who had property (Mt 6^{24}, Lk 16^{13}; Mk 10^{17-31}, cf. Mt 19^{16-30}, Lk 18^{18-30}) or strong family ties (Mt 10^{37}; cf. Lk 14^{26}) be of an undivided will. In the Parables of the Hid Treasure and the Costly Pearl (Mt $13^{44ff.}$) the price to be paid for participation in the glory of life in the Divine Community is—everything that a man has at his command. The requirement of a new ethos befitting the present *βασιλεία* receives particularly radical expression in Mt 5^{21-48}, where—in a series of utterances about anger, adultery, divorce, oaths, retaliation, loving enemies—it is gradually brought to view and then in *v.*^{48} is found in a 'perfection' shared with God ('ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect'). In this forty-eighth verse preceding material is being contemplated, including that which has to do with retaliation and the loving of enemies; and from this it appears that the term 'perfect' (*τέλειος*), as applied to God, denotes the working—in Jesus and His ministry—of a goodness in Him which was not deterred by the unworthiness of men; and that to be 'perfect' as God is 'perfect' means to display a goodness like His own in however unpromising circumstances. It is a summons to perfection in love, to the very perfection of God in love for the undeserving. The perfection of His love is seen in its refusal to acknowledge that it has any enemies so long as His offer of life in the future *βασιλεία* is mercifully permitted to last, and it is not rejected. The sunshine and the rain are tokens of His undiscriminating goodness towards all men whilst He is making the offer. 'He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust' (Mt 5^{45}). 'He is kind toward the unthankful and to the evil' (Lk 6^{35}). He offers the supremely good thing of belonging to the Divine Community to good and bad alike, and He leaves nothing undone to get the offer accepted, any more than a shepherd does to find a lost sheep, or a woman a lost coin. He will not always be like that; He will judge and judge finally. But whilst the offer still holds, close with it! How? On what terms? Be—in love—as God is. How daunting! How impossible! 'Owe no man any thing, save to love one another' (Ro 13^{8}). Never imagine, Paul means, that you can get quit of the debt of love; you cannot pay it off. No, the claims of love are always new and growing; you cannot love enough.

As we cast about despairingly, we want to know whether an utterly radical demand is the last word of Jesus about response to the present *βασιλεία*. Did He perhaps in some circumstances or in some moods accept the childlike state and disposition, or being 'poor in spirit,' or 'hunger and thirst

after righteousness,' or contrition, as enough, and at other times summon to renouncement, the single will, and likeness to God in His own goodness ? Was He of a varying mind about response ? Or again, it is borne out by experience that when His moral absolute is accepted, and there is no wish for a mitigation, and no wearying of it because it cannot be obeyed in full, the strength of self-confidence dies and pride is broken, and the child-like temper of soul is discovered without which no one could enter the Divine Community. Did Jesus notice it happening to hearers who really wanted to be His followers ? Was that the reason why they were becoming childlike, 'poor in spirit,' hungry and thirsty for 'righteousness' ? To whatever extent it may be possible to account in this way for the intermingling in the Synoptic Gospels of the two kinds of utterance concerning response, it remains that the absolute demand was put forward by Jesus with all seriousness ; it was a true imperative. And it was not done with when His followers became childlike and so forth. The qualities which He welcomed in them were only precious beginnings of response.

From various recorded sayings of His it appears that after a time at all events Jesus realized that His call for full response to the βασιλεία present in His ministry would not be answered on a great scale. The Parable of the Sower, for example, may be recalled in this connexion. It is altogether likely that it reflects the experiences and anticipations of Jesus as sent to be the organ of the present eschatological Divine activity and to summon to response. His work was not to be in vain ; there would be a good result, a rich harvest ; but much failure too is reckoned with. Again : 'Enter ye in by the narrow gate : for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many be they that enter in thereby. For narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few be they that find it' (Mt $7^{13f.}$; cf. Lk $13^{23f.}$). 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin ! woe unto thee, Bethsaida ! . . .' (Mt $11^{20ff.}$, Lk $10^{13ff.}$). The time was fateful indeed. Life in the Divine Community depended upon total response. It would not come from the people in the mass. Would any ever yield it ? Who could ? 'It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God' (Mk 10^{25}). 'Then who can be saved ?'—a question which applies to every man, not only to the rich. 'With men it is impossible, but not with God : for all things are possible with God.' Old guilt, guilt incurred before the coming of Jesus, might count, did count, for nothing now that He, organ and very presence of the βασιλεία, was here ; but His imperative and yet impossible demand—what of the situation which that created for His hearers ? How should we expect Him to react to it ? It befits the nature of the present βασιλεία as the outflowing of the compassionate goodness of God upon the 'lost' that He should interpret it as offering occasion for the victory of Divine love. 'For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many' (Mk 10^{45}). By a 'ransom' (λύτρον) is meant a price paid for life, or for liberty, or for some great benefit that might be desired ; in this case it is the price to be paid for the most precious of all boons—life in the Divine Community. The Son of man in giving up His life would be paying the price of that for 'many.' He would be dying in order to get them into the still future βασιλεία. They would never get in unless He died, but as a fruit of His acceptance of the Cross they would, or they could if they chose. To the full significance of the utterance, it would seem, belongs the thought that the Son of man in dying would accomplish for 'many' the needful total response for which He had called. It is to the point here to recall the fourth Servant-Song in Is 52^{13}–53^{12}. The Song appears to require for its interpretation resort to the idea of solidarity, conceived to hold good of the Servant and the penitent nations, on which account the Servant could present them to God and they could share in the Servant's acceptability to Him. When the mind of Jesus concerning His death is under consideration, light falls upon it from 'Is 53.' As to the Servant and the nations, in the intention of Second Isaiah, so also, it may be maintained, to Jesus and the 'many' for whom He would give His life a 'ransom,' the principle of solidarity applies : His self-offering at the Cross is theirs also and makes them acceptable to God. By this inclusive sacrifice the situation which the impossible ethic of response had brought to pass is dealt with ; the response is yielded—by Him for 'many.' This is not to say that we are relieved of it now that Jesus has acted as our representative. There it is, embedded in Gospels composed with His dying in retrospect. His unlimited demand remains in authority over us, that by acceptance of it with all that in us lies we may discover our union with Him in what He did.

The βασιλεία, understood in the sense of the eschatological saving action of God, arrived in the work of Jesus. It came in what He willed to do. He willed to die. He need not have remained in the city to fall into the hands of His opponents. He chose to die. If He—He in whom the βασιλεία comes—did that, then His dying was the consummation of His work on earth ; it was the coming of the βασιλεία in all its wonder.

'This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many' (Mk 14^{24}). What, it may be asked, is the relation of the βασιλεία both in the sense just

mentioned and in that of the Divine Community (as in the next saying in Mark : ' Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God ') to the ' covenant ' (διαθήκη) spoken of here ? At the Cross takes place the supreme exercise of the seeking goodness of God ; and, again, at the Cross total response to it is made. The βασιλεία as it came when Jesus died and the response which He then yielded to it constituted the basis of the διαθήκη. Henceforth there it was, there it is, a relationship initiated between God and ourselves by a wholly Divine work (as, in that respect, was to be the new covenant in Jeremiah's prophecy [$31^{31ff.}$; cf. Ezk $11^{17f.}$ $36^{26f.}$, Ps 51^{10}]) and sustained on our side by submission to the moral absolute of Jesus. It is the life of the Divine Community with God, in so far as it can be known before the Community has been completely raised up.

Literature

FROM LUTHER TO WESLEY

In *From Luther to Wesley* (Lutterworth Press ; 16s. net) Dr. Franz Hildebrandt, now a Methodist minister in Cambridge, and formerly assistant to Pastor Niemöller at Dahlem, Berlin, has rendered a valuable service to the study of historical theology by comparing and contrasting the contributions of the two great religious teachers to Protestant doctrine. Part I is described as ' Synopsis ' ; it examines what Wesley and Luther had to say, and discusses such themes as the righteousness of faith, the Word of God, the work of Christ, the way of salvation, the means of grace, the communion of saints, the perfecting of saints, the edge of Calvinism, and the nature of enthusiasm. All these themes are illustrated by full citations from the hymns of the Wesleys and the writings of Luther. The quotations are perhaps excessive, but this fact increases the usefulness of the work for the student, who thereby gains a detailed knowledge of the original sources. Dr. Hildebrandt anticipates ' the higher critics of certain schools ' by pointing out that he has treated John and Charles as one ' Wesley,' and has taken no account of the other influences which affected the theology of Luther and Wesley. Doubtless this limitation was necessary in order to bring the work within a reasonable compass, but it may be doubted if the confession is a sufficient atonement for a manifest defect, for John and Charles Wesley cannot be understood without careful consideration of what they drew from two traditions, the Catholic and the Protestant. We must give thanks, however, for what we are actually given ; and for discerning readers the debt is very great, especially in the discussion of the view that Wesley touched ' the very edge of Calvinism.' ' It is clear,' says the author, ' that Wesley, although " very near, within a hair's breadth," does not accept the Calvinist position ; on the other hand, it is impossible, although he used the term for himself and his Magazine, to classify him simply as " Arminian " without any qualification.' On the question of the perfecting of the saints Dr. Hildebrandt agrees with Dr. J. E. Rattenbury that Wesley's teaching cannot be harmonized with those of the Reformers, and he is well justified in reminding us that Lutheranism cannot be understood, in relation to this question, ' without the background of the monastery from which the Reformation sprang.'

In Part II, ' Synthesis,' the attempt is made to ' bring together ' the ideas of Luther and Wesley in the light of New Testament teaching ; and here it is maintained that ' the real question is not how much Wesley learnt from Luther and found to correct in him, or how Luther would answer Wesley, but how both are judged and reconciled by the Word of God.' Special attention is given to Pietism. ' While Pietism is an unnecessary and dangerous detour from Luther, Wesley represents the direct apostolic and evangelical succession ; he is the Elisha on whom the mantle of the master has fallen.' The discussion is neatly set under the headings, ' The Revival of the Reformation ' and ' The Reformation of the Revival.' Effective use is made of the contributions of Theodor Jellinghaus, a forgotten writer, unknown in this country.

Part III, ' Harmony,' is ' in the nature of a musical appendix.' To the question whether Wesley's associations are not entirely with Moravian conventicles, and the music of Pietism, Dr. Hildebrandt gives an emphatic ' No.' In a valuable attempt to establish new direct connexions between Wesley's hymns and the Lutheran chorales, he examines a list of Wesley's hymns and mentions those which might be more successfully ' wedded ' to a German chorale. He claims that the direction in which Wesley should be interpreted ' musically no less than theologically, leads straight away from the desert of Pietism and

Salvationism towards Gerhardt, Luther and the Reformation—the rock whence he was hewn.' Altogether, the book is virile and stimulating; it is full of information and sounds a strong note of challenge.

VINCENT TAYLOR

THE FREEDOM OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND

The Archbishop of York said recently that no State Church possesses such liberty as does the Church of Scotland. To Scottish churchmen that is a platitude. According to Lord Hugh Cecil, the arrangement made in Scotland 'harmonizes with a definiteness and completeness for which I think no parallel in Christian history is to be found—the National Recognition of Religion with the spiritual Freedom of the Church.' And there are other envious tributes in plenty that might be quoted. But the facts are not well known outside of Scotland. Here comes a book that might bring enlightenment, *The Claims of the Church of Scotland*, by Professor G. D. Henderson (Hodder and Stoughton; 15s. net). It is written by a fair-minded man who seeks to give every one his due. The flowing tide of the style sweeps one along. And a marked feature is the number of extraordinarily apt quotations from all kinds of sources.

Here is not only an account of the centuries of self-sacrifice through which the freedom was won, but much information useful to outsiders of what a Presbyterian Church is, and how it functions and does its work. A few of the chapter headings are 'Scotland and the Bible,' 'Scotland and Calvinism,' 'A Responsible Laity,' 'Church and State,' 'Church and People,' 'The Ministry,' 'Courts and Committees,' 'Relations with Other Churches,' and so on.

This should prove a really useful book.

A. J. GOSSIP

THE HERO WITH A THOUSAND FACES

A composite photograph of the symbolisms of the various religions is attempted in *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, by Mr. Joseph Campbell (Allen and Unwin; the Bollingen Series, xvii.; 25s. net), but, as often happens with such attempts, the result is not very clear. Synthesis is unrestrained by historical considerations, and definiteness is branded as sectarian. The point of view is that, though religious myths may be infinitely various, similarities are of primary importance and decisive for purposes of valuation, on the principle—quoted from Tolstoy—that 'happy families are all alike,' and that therefore, presumably though illogically, what is similar has the highest worth. The unity of truth may be emphasized, and the unification of those who are searching after truth may be furthered by stressing similarities even at the cost of disregard of differences. By a comparative study of the mythologies of all periods and peoples we may form a picture of the universal hero with the thousand faces, and trace his development through his revolt from conventional belief and custom, his initiation into the spiritual world, and his difficult return to the world of sense for the purpose of mediating the salvation of mankind.

We must not, it is urged, be so influenced by modern matter-of-factness as to underestimate the importance of myths, for it is nothing less than a misfortune that we should be left to face the problems of contemporary life without the supporting guidance of mythology. Wordsworth would have sympathized here, but our author is more fortunate in that his later date has made it possible for him to enlist the services of Jung and other psycho-analysts in his speculative enterprise, and to suggest that myth is the outcome of the striving of the unconscious in human beings everywhere. Yet myths in his view are not mere imaginations; they have an objective basis and are the effect upon us of the superconscious source of all life. This cosmic superconscious descends into our unconscious, and has to be rediscovered again, which, precisely, is the religious quest undertaken by the hero in the thousand and more varieties of spiritual adventure. A link between the individual and the world—or between psychology and metaphysics—may be discovered, suggests the writer, in the fairy tale, which is a fantasy for the particular person whereas the myth is a revelation for the universal man. Not a revelation, be it noted, in the sense of being ultimate but only as a guide to the final vision, to be discarded when the goal is reached.

It is the unwillingness to discard the temporary guide, the insistence upon turning myth into history, that calls forth the severest diatribes in this book. 'Mythology,' the author tells us, 'is psychology misread as biography, history, and cosmology.' Everything must be left delightfully vague. What does it matter whether Jesus Christ or Buddha or any other religious leader ever lived? The symbol is the important thing and not the factual basis. To insist upon the exclusiveness or paramountcy of Christianity is sectarianism, and the author shows a strong bias in favour of the indefiniteness of Eastern thought, its ethical neutrality in the suggestion that the distinction between good and evil belongs to a lower level, its fusion of time and eternity, of the One and the Many.

Yet the vapourizing of the historical may

give us pause. How can the interpenetration of time and eternity, we may ask, retain any significance if the temporal is wholly unreal, and if the Incarnation, as a supreme example of historical claiming, has no ultimate significance? And the author himself seems to admit this in his emphasis upon the difficulty of the return of the enlightened hero for the accomplishment of the salvation of mankind. Where is the world to which he may return if it has no abiding place in the purpose of the love of God for an actuality which He has created and desires to redeem?

This book is clearly written but its clarity is not continuous. It is beautifully printed and profusely illustrated, but the framework is rather too elaborate for the contents. Vagueness and negation are not the last words; a metaphysical and religious positive is required, and history demands a meaning.

W. S. URQUHART

PHILIP DODDRIDGE

Philip Doddridge, 1702–51. His Contribution to English Religion, edited by the Rev. Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A., D.D. (Independent Press; 7s. 6d. net), is a tribute to Doddridge on the two hundredth anniversary of his death. The book consists of seven different chapters written by six different writers. It is a book in which the interest never flags and which presents Doddridge as a really great man. From this composite picture of Doddridge certain impressions emerge. For one thing, Doddridge must have been a man of immense industry. He wrote three hundred and seventy-five hymns. He published two hundred and thirty lectures on Divinity. He tells us that after writing by hand between fifty and sixty letters in a fortnight he had still one hundred and six left to answer. In point of fact his letters and diary take up five printed volumes. For another thing, he was far in advance of his time as a man of wide sympathies. Dr. Nuttall suggests that the inscription on the tomb of John Howard might well apply to Doddridge too—'Whoever thou art, thou standest at the tomb of thy friend.' A Particular Baptist said of him by way of criticism: 'He was a great and a good man, but a very bad tutor. . . . He gave both sides of the question.' But, above all, he was a good man. One who knew him well said of him: 'Upon the whole I bear him this testimony, that I never remember to have spent an hour in his company, but it was my own fault if I went not from him something wiser or better.' In an age when we largely avoid oratory and emotion in preaching we might do well to remember Doddridge's saying about the passions and the emotions: 'They are the sails of the soul. The preacher must endeavour to fill them with a prosperous wind.'

Dr. Nuttall and his team have done an excellent job in making Philip Doddridge live again for to-day. A perfervid Scot might object to the subtitle, 'His Contribution to *English* Religion,' especially when Doddridge wrote 'O God of Bethel' and 'Father of peace and God of love,' these two paraphrases so dear to *Scottish* hearts.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

UNSCALED WALLS

A Theological Commission of 'Faith and Order' gives in a Report called *Ways of Worship* (S.C.M.; 2s. net) a grave, clear, and comprehensive review of the differences about worship that hinder movements for the integration of the churches. If its inclination is just a little towards what is commonly and vaguely called a High Church attitude, that reflects a trend noticeable in most churches to-day and the fact that people with that outlook are likely to be those most interested in 'Faith and Order.' The Report, however, is a very fair, candid, sympathetic, and illuminating account of the varieties of views and practices that exist and their theological implications, which could hardly have been better done. It is of high value and deserves wide consideration.

The purpose of the Report is not controversy, but merely the marking and delimitation of the areas in which controversy exists or is bound to emerge. They do not therefore comment on the proposal they note, to the effect that the difference between the ideas of the repetition and representation of Christ's sacrifice in the Eucharist might be ingeniously solved by inserting a hyphen in the word re-presentation, which could then be read in an ambiguous sense. They might, however, have pointed out that the different views really reach down to a deeper question not usually faced, namely whether the Cross was in some sense like Old Testament sacrifices a symbolic drama, that, like a work of art, can have repeated performances; or whether it was an event in history, totally real, to which no return can be made except by way of commemoration and contemplation.

A reading of this pamphlet, so wisely informed and fair must stir not only hopes but in many minds the anxious wonder how far all these concerns are relevant to the realities of the religious life of to-day or to-morrow. What kind of Church do they envisage as emerging from the present situation to carry on the Christian tradition? Is it to be a company of clergy closely knit together

by elaborate and subtle theological convictions along with followers who show their adherence mainly by participation in ritual and liturgy; and is it thus that the witness to Jesus and the gospel will be perpetuated in an unbelieving world? The Report twice makes deft use of the term existential. It suggests that in worship the Church takes decisions that are not doctrinal but existential. Just how much of theological controversy and ecclesiastical negotiation would pass this modern test of being 'existential'?

R. W. STEWART

QUAKERISM

While acknowledging the value of the Church's heritage in theology and worship and organization a wistful thought haunts many a Christian mind that something simpler might win and hold the interest of common men in the gospel. Mr. R. Duncan Fairn's Swarthmore Lecture for 1951—*Quakerism: A Faith for Ordinary Men* (Allen and Unwin; 5s. net)—is so captivating and persuasive, so pervaded by a sense of spiritual and ethical reality, so sanely extrovert in outlook that it must make the reader ask whether the future of Christianity does not lie with something like Quakerism; but having the militant evangelistic zeal of the Salvation Army or the Apostolic Church. A feeling that this element could be added to Quakerism lies behind the title of this Lecture. The author is concerned about the limited range of its membership in Britain—twenty thousand in fifty millions. Might not the logic of his thought have led him on to urge that Friends should throw themselves more into propagandist effort? They would do this in some wise way of their own from which all might learn, and they might win a great response.

R. W. STEWART

Dr. G. A. Buttrick, born and educated in England, found his niche finally in Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, and in the land of his adoption has earned a high reputation as scholar and preacher. We have from his pen *So We Believe So We Pray* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $2.75). It is an admirable and persuasive exposition of the fundamentals of Christian belief—God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church, Forgiveness, and Life Eternal; then of the petitions of the Lord's Prayer. There is real profundity of thought veiled in interesting and simple language with abundant illustrations—a book from which the scholar will learn something, and which the laymen will find again and again illuminating.

It must be thirty years or so since Mr. Arthur Waley wrote in the Asiatic Review a learned paper on Li Po. He has now sent out *The Poetry and Career of Li Po, 701–762 A.D.* (Allen and Unwin; 8s. 6d. net). It is a book which those who want to know about the famous Chinese poet will have to reckon with. For, of course, Mr. Waley is a recognized master in these fields, with a long list of translations and the like to his credit. And he has put his fullness of knowledge into this volume. Li Po was not an estimable character. 'He appears in his works as boastful, callous, dissipated, irresponsible, and untruthful. In especial he was a sad drunkard. In a poem to his wife he confesses that his drunkenness made him as good as no husband at all.' Moreover he seems to have been a man with a grievance, that most irritating of mortals. 'He is the only well-known writer who neither went in for the Literary Examinations (the normal method of entry into the Civil Service) nor ever held any regular official post.' No one knows why he so acted. But it told against him heavily all his life. Among other possibilities it is suggested that 'he may have doubted his capacity to remain sober for so long on end.' Now the rest of the acts of Li Po—as the Kings and Chronicles would put it—are they not written in this full book?

One would bespeak a warm welcome and a willing hearing for all that is said in *The Theology of Evangelism*, by the Rev. Henry Cook, M.A. (Carey-Kingsgate Press; 6s. net). Dr. Denney once said it is the preacher's task to make the obvious arresting. What Mr. Cook has to say is for the most part the assured central conviction of every earnest liberal evangelical minister to-day. But he says it with a force and charm and relevance to the present situation that constantly arrests the reader, and his treatment of his theme combines the judgment of a well-equipped theologian and the urgency of a true evangelist. It is a book profound yet easy to read, equally fitted to set a fumbling tyro on to right lines and to move the best and most experienced minister to fresh heart-searching and to new effort.

Professor Reginald O. Kapp, B.Sc. (Eng.), M.I.E.E., has followed up his study of 'Science versus Materialism' with *Mind, Life and Body* (Constable; 12s. 6d. net). He begins with a criticism of how the relationship has been too often discussed amid a confusion arising partly

from indefiniteness of language and ambiguity in questions and partly because the writers have had some metaphysical or theological axe to grind. His own aim is to direct scientists to an important field which as scientists they have been very reluctant to enter, although Professor Kapp holds it is of the greatest importance that science should enter. To sum up his own attitude and approach he holds that there are two views tenable as to causality—a monistic and a dualistic. According to the former all that happens has and can only have purely physical causes. According to the latter, mind and life, immaterial and non-physical, enter to play a determining part. He examines both sides, both full of difficulty, but comes down on the dualistic side. He is not interested in metaphysical or theological consequences, he is interested only in the problem that a dualistic universe presents to the scientist. He modestly claims that he is a mere pioneer in a large and difficult field for scientific inquiry and is urgent that scientists must proceed to face up to the problem. The book is indeed ' strong meat ' but is most lucidly written.

The Early Church and the New Testament (Longmans ; 8s. 6d. net), by Miss Irene Allen, B.A., Scripture Mistress at Howell's School, Llandaff, is a general introduction to the New Testament intended primarily for use in Grammar Schools and Training Colleges. It is good to see from this very commendable volume that the results of the modern critical study of the New Testament are being embodied in Grammar School and Training College instruction in religion. This should help to counteract the dismaying effects upon young people brought up in an atmosphere of Biblical piety when first they encounter the doctrines of modern science and of modern culture in general. The first part of this book deals with the world to which Christ came, thus describing the environment in which His ministry was conducted. The second and main part, entitled ' The Christian Witness,' follows the usual lines of an ' Introduction,' but beginning with St. Paul and his Epistles and going on to the Synoptic Gospels and the rest of the New Testament documents. A useful bibliography is appended of books recommended for further study. The whole book is written in a clear and popular style, and offers wise and careful guidance on points in dispute. The reference, for example, to the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of Christ is worth quoting in its entirety : ' The doctrine that He was born of a Virgin Mother was accepted by the Church at a very early date, enshrined in its great creeds, and, until our own day, scarcely questioned—at least by Christians. There are many people, still, who believe that the birth of Jesus must have taken place under the circumstances which Luke describes. They feel that He was such a wonderful Person that He must have come into the world in a unique manner. But there are others who, though equally impressed by the wonder of the Incarnation, cannot accept the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, on both historical and moral grounds. They point out that this doctrine formed no part of the earliest Christian preaching, being entirely ignored by both Paul and Mark, and it is never hinted at in any of the sermons in Acts. On moral grounds they feel that if Jesus is really the perfect Man—the one great Example of what God intended man to be—then He must have had to pass through exactly the same experiences as we do—even before birth. If Jesus had no human father, then He was *not* like us in every respect.'

Man's Pain and God's Goodness, by the Rev. J. V. Langmead Casserley, D.Litt., M.A., A.K.C. (Mowbray ; 2s. 6d. net), is a little book on the problem of pain and suffering. It has three main chapters—Pain in Theory, Pain in the Bible, and Pain in Practice. It can be said truly that this book is just as useful or just as useless as all other books on the problem of suffering. Dr. Langmead Casserley himself says, ' Christian writers and preachers must always avoid giving the impression that in their view a Christian is a man who knows the answer to all possible spiritual and religious questions.' That is not, however, to say ' that because the Christian cannot know everything he knows nothing.' Dr. Langmead Casserley is well aware that no answer to this problem is complete. After all, Jesus Christ came not to explain suffering but to teach men how to conquer it.

While we think that Dr. Marie-Magdeleine Davy rises into too high ecstasy in her laudations of her heroine, her monograph, *The Mysticism of Simone Weil*, translated competently by Miss Cynthia Rowland (Rockliff ; 5s. 6d. net), does give an account of a very interesting personality, and attempts to set forth her peculiar type of mysticism. Simone Weil died at the age of thirty-four, worn out by her stern self-denial and her attempts to live and work at manual occupations among the very poor. That was her kind of saintliness. Her thought as here expounded will remain ' caviare to the multitude,' and even a student of the mystics will sometimes be puzzled.

Mr. W. H. V. Reade, for forty years Tutor in Philosophy in Keble College, died in 1943. He left,

however, practically ready for the Press a masterly work—*The Christian Challenge to Philosophy*—which is now published (S.P.C.K.; 13s. 6d net). It is a very notable monument to the memory of a profound scholar and original thinker as to whom one must regret that the shyness which was so marked a trait of his lovable personality probably caused his too few excursions into book-writing. It is one of the most informative and helpful books on philosophy and the Christian faith that has ever come into our hands. Whether one is specially interested in Platonism, Stoicism, Aquinas, or present-day ideologies one will find here a real mine. The literary style is charming, lit up frequently with flashes of wit and paradox. An excellent prefatory chapter by Mr. Cyril Bailey, an intimate friend, conveys the picture of a very attractive personality.

William Cunningham, Teacher and Priest, by Miss Audrey Cunningham, M.A., F.R.Hist.Soc., with a Preface by Mr. F. R. Salter (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net), is the biography of a man who lived a full and varied life. Cunningham was the man who laid the foundation of Economic History as a university subject in Cambridge University and it is likely that it is on that achievement that his main claim to fame must rest. But in addition to that he was first Vicar of Great St. Mary's Church and then Archdeacon of Ely, in both of which offices he exercised a wide and fine influence. There is a brass memorial tablet to him in Latin in the ante-chapel of Trinity College. The inscription was written by J. D. Duff who also provided an English translation of it. It includes the lines 'He was a man of high courage and great activity, who proved his worth in many offices, learned in many sciences, in Economic History a chief authority, an expounder of the Christian religion and a pattern of it.' One of the greatest early influences on him was that of F. D. Maurice. A quotation of real value is given from Maurice with regard to the Bible. 'The Bible, as a means of attaining to the knowledge of the living God, is precious beyond all expression or conception; but when made a substitute for that knowledge may become a greater deadener to the human spirit than all other books.' Cunningham's view of preaching is extremely interesting. 'He did not think the pulpit the right place from which to attempt the defence of the Christian religion. The most complete answer to the disparagement or denial of revealed truth could do no more than convince the intellect; it could never, from its very nature, touch the heart. . . . Experience convinced him that it was also a mistake to use the pulpit for exposing abuses. . . . The preacher did better to teach positive truth; if he set himself to rebuke evil he was tempted to speak in his own name and not in Christ's.' These are wise words.

There is one very pleasant anecdote which is well worth repeating. It comes from the chapter on Cambridge during the First World War. 'The military atmosphere was exhilarating, and army manners among the Cadets and Officers on the streets were a distinct improvement upon those of the University. To some extent this survived the War; one friend of the Cunninghams, a nurse coming off night duty, met two undergraduates in Trinity Street, one of whom stepped off the pavement to make way for her. Surprised, she looked again at this polite undergraduate; it was the Duke of York, now H.M. King George the Sixth.'

Doubtless this book is an example of family *pietas,* the tribute of a distinguished daughter to a distinguished father, but, for all that, it is well worth reading for its own interest and for the interest of its subject.

A brilliant, rapid, explanatory sketch and explanation of recent inventions like aeroplanes, radio, radar, television, is given in Mr. A. M. Young's *Man's Modern Miracles—or God's?* (Stockwell; 7s. 6d. net), which is quite a valuable compendium of scientific and technical information.

The author has had the quaint notion deftly to insert every few pages a little testimony to his belief in the Divine Source of all power and being; for example, in brackets at the top of a list of elements stand the words 'All created by God'; at another place 'then came God's greatest contribution to radio—the revelation to Ambrose Fleming of the (amplifying) valve.'

Dr. Wilbur M. Smith has published a volume entitled *Chats from a Minister's Library* (W. A. Wilde Co., Boston; $2.50), and hopes to follow it with other volumes on the same theme. The chats are on a great variety of topics and several of them are the scripts of Broadcasts. The majority deal with books and the use of books. The author amid manifold activities found time to read and make notes of interesting things he came across. Many ministers may well feel rebuked that they have not done so with anything like adequacy.

The Old Testament and the Approach to Religion

By the Most Reverend John A. F. Gregg, D.D., Primate of all Ireland

It is coming to be widely recognized that allusions to Biblical characters or narratives have a strange and unfamiliar sound in the ears of many of our fellow-countrymen to-day. It can no longer be taken for granted that the reference will be understood. We can no longer *assume* that the background of any one's education will have included religious instruction.

This situation has its advantages and its disadvantages. Plainly, it is a desirable thing that if, as Christians believe, God not only exists, but seeks to be known to men, the idea of God should be presented to them and embraced from early childhood. On the other hand, the religious instruction of young or old is beset by the constant danger that waits on the learning of any subject prescribed for study and transmitted by a teacher, and also on any subject that has lost the freshness of its appeal through familiarity and repetition.

But this is a danger which has to be faced, and can to a large extent be met where the teacher takes an interest in what is the very groundwork of education. But there is a greater danger than that of familiarity—a danger into which not infrequently the most earnest of teachers of religion fall—and that is, the giving of too little attention to the outworks and the foundations of religion, and the pressing on to its central truths before the learner is sufficiently prepared for them.

I doubt if we have taken to heart as we should have done the lesson which is written across the very face of the Bible, composed as it is of the Old Testament followed by the New, namely, that what prepared the disciples of our Lord for receiving the revelation of Himself as Messiah was the religious upbringing afforded by the Judaism of the old covenant. The Old Testament does not merely precede the New Testament in time, it contains the presuppositions which alone make it intelligible. It is a tragic fact that the light which has come to us in Christ and shines out through the New Testament has had the effect for Christian people generally of obscuring and discounting the Old Testament revelation, and of impairing for them the sense of its authority. This tendency has been strengthened by the notion, entirely unwarranted, and neither shared nor encouraged by most Old Testament scholars, that the criticism of the Old Testament has reduced it to being a negligible composition of only second-class importance, in fact, an old and poor relation of the New Testament.

For this superficial judgment no justification can be derived from any true reading of the New Testament. To Dr. Hort, who could write that 'the dream of a Christianity without Judaism is in effect an abnegation of Apostolic Christianity,' it was a general principle that the New Testament is written in terms of the Old Testament. For the Christian Church in its first centuries, as for its Master Christ both before and after the Resurrection, the appeal was consistently to the Old Testament. It was for Him and for them a primary authority; behind its witness they showed no disposition to go. They had been brought up on its teachings, they lived by them, they commended them to their followers.

By way of illustration of this, I might recall the work done thirty years ago by my teacher, Dr. Rendel Harris, on the subject of *Testimonies*, *i.e.*, early collections of excerpts from the Old Testament such as those found in St. Cyprian's works, intended to serve as proof-texts (if one may use a hackneyed expression) to Jew and heathen, upon which to found arguments in proof of the validity of the Christian revelation. No. The modern disrepute, or rather, eclipse, which has come upon the Old Testament draws no support from Apostolic Christianity, and is no token of respect for it—rather we should regard ourselves as deserving of stern reproof for our neglect of what its first teachers viewed as the title-deeds of its inheritance. To them the Christian Church was the lawful heir of the promises made to Israel, and of the prerogatives of God's ancient people recorded in the Old Testament.

Is it not a remarkable testimony to the reality of Hebrew religious experience that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in treating of the subject of Faith, should not only build on the old prophet's words—'the just shall live by his faithfulness,' but should be content to draw his long series of illustrations exclusively from Hebrew pre-Christian history? If the vision of God had not been something divinely given; if men's response had not been divinely prompted and divinely rewarded, how could he have instanced these men and women of pre-Christian faith as valid witnesses to that indispensable spiritual experience of which Christ was ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτής Way-leader and Consummator?

I have said this because I want to re-assert the still continuing validity of the Old Testament revelation and writings. They were fulfilled in

Christ—a new and deeper meaning may have been given to them by His Coming, but nothing has for that reason been withdrawn or subtracted from them. They are still, as before, the vehicle of a real and progressive self-manifestation by God, and as such they possess an undiminished authority to-day. And their purpose and their authority to-day is that of a preparation for the Messiah, or the Christ, without whose Epiphany they would be like trees, still living indeed, but trees that had failed to bear their promised fruit.

A preparation, I say, because historically as well as psychologically, the human spirit needs to begin with the less in order that it may be made ready for the more. 'The path of the just,' as the Book of Proverbs reminds us, 'is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day,' *i.e.*, the full strength of midday light does not burst on the eye in one sudden blaze. It begins as a thin streak of glow on the eastern horizon, and only gradually advances from strength to strength.

So in the progress of the soul of man. In man's Divine, as in his human, relationships, the rule is step by step, here a little and there a little. In the Early Church, there were definite stages in the introduction of the Catechumen to religious knowledge. The Creed and the Sacred Mysteries were withheld from him until he had shown himself worthy. And if this law were better recognized as something underlying our educational work to-day I believe its results would be more lasting. The point I am concerned to make is that there is a religious groundwork which should come first, and provide the foundation for more advanced and differentiated teaching to follow. And the Old Testament exists to present this groundwork to the Christian educator. For the Old Testament is the record of a progressive revelation. It provides us with an authoritative interpretation of the spiritual history of a people. As the people grows its perception of God grows. 'God, who at sundry times and in divers manners'—in many parts and in many fashions—'spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets.' God spoke as they, or, at any rate, as their most spiritually minded leaders were able to hear. It was a very patient process—it had its advances and its regressions—but it reckoned with a somewhat gross human nature, and did not attempt to drive it too fast. And in that process God was not afraid even to use inadequate or anthropomorphic conceptions, and to cause men to learn some lessons which later would need to be unlearnt.

And that is why the gradual method of revelation presented by the Old Testament—even with what we can only feel are its blemishes—is never out of date or outgrown. The teacher, as St. Augustine said, must be within. Each new generation as it comes has to learn its own lessons: every child, every seeker has to begin on the ground floor as he learns about God, and must climb by his own efforts. He cannot grow by standing on any one else's shoulders; he must begin for himself and at the beginning. That is to say, before he learns about Christ as the Incarnate Revealer of the Invisible God he should learn about the God whom Christ is to reveal. If he is to place Christ aright in his scheme of beliefs he must have some idea of God, and of a self-revealing God, in relation to whom he is to place Him. That was the order in which the Divine revelation proceeded with the disciples, and (we may say) the only right and natural order. And that is the order provided for us by the Bible. In the Old Testament men are taught about God before in the New Testament they are taught about God in Christ. Look at our Lord's teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. It starts from that amount of knowledge which His hearers already possess in the Old Testament. It fills in and draws out that knowledge. It solidifies and deepens the original ground-truths of the One God.

I always think the Fourth Gospel should be viewed in this light. It is commonly treated (and by no means wrongly) as that Gospel which more than the others witnesses to the Divinity of Christ. But I think its purpose is primarily to witness to what the Father is, as seen in and through the Son. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' And I am reminded of the words of a well-known mystical writer, who passed from our midst only two or three years ago. 'You see,' she writes, 'I come to Christ through God, whereas lots of people come to God through Christ. But I can't show them how to do that—all I know about is the reverse route.' Yes, but what she calls the 'reverse route,' the approach to Christ through God, is the historic Christian order of approach. The disciples learnt of God first, and then learnt more fully of Him in Christ.

This is one of the reasons why many find themselves sceptical in regard to the Christian Faith. They have never really learnt the groundwork. And this is why many who find they cannot believe in Christ think that that disposes of revealed religion altogether. They think that when belief in Christ goes, belief in a self-revealing God must go too. But that is to invert the true order. Belief in God—belief in the One living and self-revealing God—was possible for many years before ever Christ appeared, and is the working faith of the pious Jew to-day. And, as witness to that quite solid fact, we possess this practical consideration, namely, that with all our greater knowledge of God that has come to us in Christ, the Christian Church has never outgrown its use of the Psalter,

the hymn-book of post-Exilic Judaism, as its manual of public as well as private devotion. And, further, much of the Church's highest language in its liturgical approach to Almighty God is drawn both in idea and in word (as, for example, the Tersanctus in the Te Deum and the Communion office) from the prophets of the Old Testament equally with the Psalmists.

What we need to remember, and to guide our teaching by, is that the Old Testament contains a valid and authoritative communication to the Hebrews concerning God—a teaching which stands in its own right as surely to-day as when there was no Christian revelation to set its seal upon it.

In a materialistic age it is of the first importance that the idea of a personal and righteous God should be nurtured and tended from the earliest days. I do not say ' implanted ' because I believe the idea is there, and if it were not there, native to the human soul, I doubt if it ever could be able to find a home there. And it is here that the Old Testament, with its insistent reference to the supreme and dominating moral personalness of God, comes to our aid.

There is no endeavour to prove the existence of God—no abstract philosophical approach to Theism. A living, acting God is there. What the history of the Hebrew people shows is how a more or less formless notion gradually assumed form and substance for the nation through a series of acts of a national kind which were shown to give evidence of the nature of the Being whose acts they were. And thus it was that, step by step, the Being known as the nation's God, Jehovah or Jahveh, drew further and further away from the level of the merely national gods, such as Chemosh or Molech, and asserted Himself progressively as One—as Living—as Personal—as Righteous—as Spiritual—as Loving—as hating and judging evil and yet merciful and forgiving—as transcendent in Majesty and Holiness—as Creator—as Universal—as Providence—and above all as the people's Covenant God. It is this tremendous and advancing self-disclosure of the Being and Character of God, wrought out through the vicissitudes of a national history, through the direct experience of contact with God on the part of the prophets, and frequently in sharp opposition to the tendencies of the popular will—it is this revelation that is the achievement for which the Old Testament stands. Like Abraham, the people went out not knowing whither they went. *Via eorum visio Dei*, as St. Augustine said. Their way through history, as through the wilderness, was an ever-unfolding vision of God.

Judges, Kings, Prophets, Priests, acting under the constraint of Providence, guided them from point to point in their spiritual as in their secular advance, and finally left in place of a Kingdom a Church, with a Temple and a Ritual, with a sacred Law and (above all) a profound Faith in one Righteous and Merciful God, Lord of heaven and earth.

But the ethical monotheism at which Judaism arrived was no barren Deism—no conception of a cold and remote transcendent onlooker. The God of the Hebrews sought fellowship with man, and offered Himself to be known. Side by side with the growing content of the idea of God, there unfolded itself a doctrine of man, and of man as related to and dependent on a righteous God. Religion may have had its elements of ritual observance, but it was far more than an institutional cult, it had to do with the moral relations of moral beings. The early covenant had as its declared basis on the human side the keeping of the law of God. Samuel's words to Saul, ' Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice,' Nathan's words to David, ' Thou art the man,' Amos' demand for social righteousness, Hosea's picture of the frustrated love of God for Israel, Micah's question, ' What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God ?,' Ezekiel's ' The soul that sinneth, *it* shall die,' the Psalmist's ' Thou desirest truth in the inward parts '—all these utterances coming from widely differing periods, and yet all pointing in the one direction, show us how the religion of the Old Testament yoked together worship and character, religion and conduct, faith and duty.

And this continuous witness to God's search for man and to His call for man's response rests to a large extent on that remarkable phenomenon of Hebrew religion, namely, the prophets. We can admit that what used to be called the argument from prophecy, the correspondence between earlier predictions and later events, very often failed to convince in the form commonly presented, but I doubt if the argument from the prophets as forth-tellers of truth rather than as foretellers of the future, receives the attention, or is allowed the weight, that is its due. F. D. Maurice's *Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament* did something to arouse men to the cardinal importance of their mission, and happily he has numerous successors to-day. For here we have a long line of men who were, so they believed and asserted, in first-hand repeatedly experienced contact with God.

Into the psychology of the prophetic consciousness, whereby men were led to perceive, with a sense of conviction and certainty which left them in no doubt of the reality of their experience, truths of God which they passed on to the men of their day with the preface of 'Thus saith the Lord'—into questions of psychology we cannot enter now. But the growing light upon the God of Israel, the

light which, mediated through men of successive ages, and, ever growing in purity, graciousness, and spirituality, gathered itself into the one stream of revelation; that growing light points us to an intervention, for which merely human agency cannot adequately account—a Divine activity which so shaped their experience that God could use their voices to express His mind and will. Even the fuller Christian revelation makes no attempt to detract from the witness of the prophets. It accepts it—rests on it, fills it out—but questions neither its veracity nor its validity. The 'law and the prophets' are assumed by Christ Himself as an established authority, behind which He does not seek to go.

Now it is this groundwork, this preparatory and yet utterly fundamental body of teaching concerning the being of God, that I am satisfied is not used to-day as fully as it should be used. It is so basal that Christian teachers tend to take it for granted, as being established beyond question in the common mind. But that is exactly what is not the case in the present day. Materialism, whether speculative or practical, dominates, or shapes unconsciously, the outlook of ever-growing numbers. And God is not to be treated as a universally conceded postulate. It was not in St. Paul's day only that the adjective 'unknown' could be fitly applied. The Christian Creeds must perhaps bear some of the responsibility for this. They tell us very little about the God and Father of us all. The reason no doubt is that each article of the Creed represents (as has been well said) 'the tombstone of a buried controversy,' and what had been the least controverted had the least said about it. As very few Christians disputed the existence and Fatherhood of God, there seemed no necessity to enlarge upon the subject of general consent.

But in the civilization of to-day God is both challenged by some and neglected by others. And it is not merely a question to-day of vindicating the authority of Christ to reveal God, it is a question of vindicating the existence of a God who needs to be revealed. The Early Church, like our Lord, turned to the Old Testament to tell of God—His existence, His providence, His character, His workings, while the New Testament could leave much concerning the Father unsaid, because it could be found in the Old Testament. But to-day, with the Old Testament less and less known, what is coming to be the content of the word 'God' for our contemporaries? And still more, what meaning has the 'fear of God' in our so-called Christian civilization? May it not therefore be the case that, as the approach of God to man was, in the earliest days, gradual, so in these days of ignorance the presentation of God should begin with what was the first to be disclosed? Should not the substructure precede the superstructure? the base of the pyramid precede its apex?

We are accustomed to hear of man's search for God. There is indeed such a thing, here and there, how widely spread it is hard to know. But the much more important reality is God's search for every man—and this is what the Old Testament in the Law, the prophetic consciousness and the writings, stands for. And the earlier stages of this, which led up to this fullness of the time when the *praeparatio evangelica* should be complete, are to be seen in the revelation to the Hebrew people. Men spake from God moved by the Holy Ghost—a succession of men far removed from one another in place and time, and thus incapable of any concerted scheme—and yet, a succession of men whose utterances disclose a consistency of moral perception so steady and sustained as to suggest an organic mutual relationship. The modern Church has not made anything like the use it should do—whether evidentially or morally—of the prophets of the Old Testament. If it is not a voice that spoke to them from a higher world, whose voice was it? It calls for far more credulity to believe that the prophets of the Old Testament were self-prompted than that they were the mouthpiece of God.

And if we have in the prophets the voice of God to men we are by no means without equally exalted illustrations of the response of men to God. And of course I refer to the Psalmists. Man will never come to a living response to God until he takes action towards God, until he acts towards Him as One who is really there. And the form of man's action is speech—he must speak to God.

And in the Psalms we find the utterances of men to whom God was a substantial and present reality. Exactly how their minds conceived of a personal God we know not, but that they felt that their hearts conversed with a living, if unseen, Being, is patently plain. 'O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee.' 'Whom have I in heaven but the?' So real is their perception and conviction of God that Christ Himself in His darkest hour could express Himself through their cries.

The Christian Church has never been able to leave the Psalms behind in its advance. Their reality makes them true to the heart of man in his thirst for God in every age. And so, here we have for our encouragement—when we wonder if there is a God who hears—recorded utterances, so simple in their directness and so sure in their confidence, that they almost compel belief in the truth of their witness to an actual fellowship with God. The response of these men to God presents as strong a suggestion of inspiration as does the antecedent revelation itself of God to man.

The Psalms, together with the Law, the prophets and the other writings, have reached us through the piety of that all-too-little-known period, the period, *i.e.*, of post-Exilic Judaism lasting for the five hundred years before Christ. To post-Exilic Judaism, for all its legalism, its ceremonialism and its national exclusiveness, spiritual religion owes more than we can say. In spite of cruel repression, the ethical monotheism of the prophets was never compromised or forgotten, while the worship of the One God, both corporate and individual, was scrupulously maintained. It meditated long and lovingly on the works and ways of God's providence. It drew out what was implicit in its inherited revelation, for example, the universalism of the Book of Jonah, the immortality asserted by the Book of Daniel, the satisfyingness of the Divine Law, as in Ps 119. And not least, it translated its Hebrew scriptures into Greek. And the Psalms, however late some of them may be, are the crowning element in that gathered harvest of sacred writings, collected and edited and protected by post-Exilic Judaism, held in trust for the yet unimaginable Event that was to come.

In the Psalter we have the Old Testament revelation in its developed form as applied religion. The study of the Psalter in its Greek Version, the product probably of the early part of the second century B.C., will reveal to us the Psalms with an unsuspected freshness. We find ourselves in an atmosphere of conscious contact with God, and of vivid perception of His presence and grace. They help us to step right aside from a humanistic intellectualism, and go down into those depths of our being where we stand face to face with the Altogether Other, that Beyond who is also within, who can liberate our spirit with the joy and wonder of knowing God, and of being known by Him.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Taking the Strain

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., B.D., Liverpool

'Bear ye one another's burdens.'—Gal 6^2.

Ever been to Lincoln? As you come into the city you see the majestic cathedral towering above the flat plain at the top of the steepest inhabited street in the kingdom. How ever did old Remigius and his architects build it?

I spent a morning there recently. The verger whom I met was simply longing to tell his story to some one. He could relate the names and dates of all the seventy-eight bishops of Lincoln. I'm afraid I was not very interested in that.

But I *was* interested in something I spotted in the choir. There is a tower towards the east end, and a couple of very ancient wooden beams seem to be holding the walls apart about fifteen feet from the ground. 'Why?' I asked. And this is what I was told.

When a tower is built, the walls have to lean slightly inwards so that, when the roof is put on, the extra weight corrects the tendency and results in a true wall. So, whilst a tower is being built, it is usual to insert a beam to hold the walls until the roof is reached, and then the beam can be taken away. Now why were the beams still in place at Lincoln? Could the great architect have made a mistake in his calculations of stresses and strains? That is what the experts thought at first, until they went up to investigate.

There was no mistake. They found stones so placed that there was only one possible conclusion. The original plan must have been for the tower to be much higher. The extra weight would have corrected the strain, and the beams could have been removed. But for some reason that extra burden was never put upon the walls, and so they do not stand true, but have still to be supported by those old beams.

In life, it often happens that we only show our true worth when we are given some responsibility. A boy in a Scout troop is made a patrol leader. Will he become a good patrol leader? We do not know. No one can tell, until he, who so far has been upheld by some one else, tries to carry with him the junior members of his new patrol.

It happens in school. A boy begins to show that he has character—he is becoming master of himself. What happens? We make him a prefect. We give him a measure of responsibility, because we know that it will bring out hidden depths of manliness which it is the purpose of a school to foster.

It has happened in history. There was a hundred and sixty years ago a pleasant young man whom every one liked. He had all the graces, but he didn't really count for much. Then Lady Middleton heard about the horrors of the slave trade. She decided to invite the young M.P. to her house and to persuade him to take the responsibility of fighting this iniquitous traffic in Parliament. That pleasant young man was William Wilberforce. And I doubt whether most of us would have heard of him if he had not been given that extra task. It made him show his true strength.

The great wonder is that God goes on trusting us, in spite of all our failures. We show our true characters as we rise to the tasks to which He calls us, and for which He always gives us strength.

Electing a Captain

By the Reverend A. Stanley Hill, Tullamore, Ireland

'Behold, I have given him for a . . . leader and commander to the people.'—Is 55^4.

The last time I was in Dublin I picked up a book on the Quays. It was the story of the ill-fated liner, the *Titanic*, told by one of the survivors, Lawrence Beesley. Have you heard of the *Titanic*? The *Titanic* was the world's biggest and fastest ship to date, the last word in comfort and elegance, and, as every one believed, in safety. She was fitted with a double bottom, and was regarded as unsinkable. The *Titanic* left Belfast, where she was built, for her maiden voyage to New York. But her first voyage proved also to be her last. She struck an iceberg and sank with the loss of hundreds of passengers and members of the crew. I was just old enough to feel, faintly, the shudder that went round the world. That was in 1912.

Many of the passengers got into the life-boats, and were rescued later by the *Carpathia*. The boat Mr. Beesley found himself in was full to overflowing, sixty people huddled together. Two sailors stood at the top and 'played out' the ropes. Gradually the life-boat was lowered down the side of the giant ship, every one holding their breath—it was a very tricky and perilous business—down and down and down all the way to the sea, seventy-five feet below. When they felt the sea under them they began to breathe again. It was a wonderful relief, and they were very grateful. But their troubles were only beginning! Everybody (and everything) was at sixes and sevens. One was pulling an oar this way. Another was pulling the opposite way. One was shouting one thing, another something else. Such a babel, and all the time they were in danger of being sucked in and down by the giant ship slowly but surely sinking to her grave at the bottom of the Atlantic. Then some one shouted, 'Is there any one in charge of this boat?' No answer. 'I propose,' he said, 'we elect a captain.' All agreed. The stoker in the stern near the rudder was unanimously elected captain. From that moment the babel ceased; the confusion was at an end. The captain gave orders. Everybody obeyed. The oarsmen kept time under his direction. The boat was got out of danger and kept from colliding with other life-boats. Hours later under the guidance of the stoker captain they were all rescued and brought to safety.

There is a lesson here for ourselves and our world. For ourselves. You and I are like that boat-load of people. If you look into yourself you will see one desire pulling you this way, and another pulling you that way. You will hear one voice telling you to do one thing, another voice telling you to do a different thing. Boys and girls, we all need a master, to whose command we bow; some one who can make us at one with ourselves, and give purpose and direction to our lives. You know who that Some One is! His name is Jesus Christ.

And there is a lesson for the world. We don't require a preacher to tell us that the world to-day is at sixes and sevens, full of confusion and anarchy. Only as Jesus, God's great gift to us all, is elected captain and leader of the nations will the world be saved from destruction, and led to sanity and safety.

'Behold, I have given him for a . . . leader and commander to the people.' Here is a prayer we should often pray: Help us, O Christ, to own Thy leadership and give our hearts to Thy obedience, and hasten the time when all shall bow to Thee, their rightful Lord and King. Amen.

The Christian Year

Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity

Harvest—Realism and Insight

By the Reverend H. G. Newsham, M.A., Edinburgh

'Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening. O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all.'—Ps $104^{23.\ 24}$.

Notice, first of all, the Psalmist's realism. He does not leave out of his Harvest Thanksgiving an acknowledgment of the part which the faithful toil of man must play in it. Many of our harvest hymns—of which more in a moment—make little or no mention of this. They have much to say about the wonders of the life-filled seed; of growth; of the revolving seasons; of rain and sunshine; and of similar Providential blessings. But they often omit this honest to goodness realism of the Psalmist who cannot speak about the works and wisdom of God without remembering that 'man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening.' Without such day long, day in and day out, labour, the valleys would never stand thick with corn, or the barns be filled.

Perhaps the Jews were bound to be realistic in this matter, because they treasured among their nation's records the story of Joseph and his brethren. It is a story with many angles to it. One of them is the way in which the Egyptians themselves, and the people of the surrounding countries, were saved from famine, after a series of calamitous harvest failures, by the foresight and

statesmanship of Joseph, who though a foreigner had risen to high rank in Pharaoh's service. He made Egypt the granary of the Middle East, through his personal drive and vision. With such a story in constant remembrance, the Hebrews could hardly fail to appreciate the part which human toil and calculation play in the provision of daily bread.

There are all the seeds in that epic of Joseph for all the recent developments which Sir John Boyd Orr has initiated in the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations; all, except one. For there is no evading the fact that Joseph exploited the situation in his day ruthlessly. He sold at famine prices, and reduced many a buyer to pauperism. But that one black spot only throws the rest into high relief. The Jews were never allowed to forget that God supplies the wants of men through their own co-operation with Him in hard and honest work; in intelligent foresight; and by the lowering of national boundaries.

To-day, the World Food Council is keenly aware that man's greatest and ever-present enemy is hunger. It is poignantly aware that undernourishment from the cradle to a premature grave is still the lot of the majority of earth's population. It warns the nations that only international action, great land settlement programmes, the opening up of undeveloped, or only partially developed, land resources, especially in Africa and Latin America, can permit the present increase of the world's population to continue without disastrous consequences by A.D. 2000. A plan is in being to feed the world; to use surpluses to help the needy; to build up reserves in bumper years against the lean ones; to encourage agricultural workers, who form seventy per cent. of the world's population, with the status and standards of living their vital importance to society deserves. The instructed interest and prayers of Christians throughout the world may make all the difference to this great humanitarian and, surely, God-inspired project. Never was this vital necessity of 'man going forth unto his work' more clamant than now.

Notice, in the second place, not only the realism, but the profound insight of the Psalmist's words. Look at it this way. Who, unfamiliar with this Psalm, would ever guess the words that were going to follow swiftly upon the heels of such a sentence as this: 'Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening'?

Or look at it in reverse. Who, unfamiliar with this Psalm, and knowing only the anthem generally sung at Harvest Festival Services, would ever guess the kind of idea which occurs immediately before this sublime outburst of praise. 'O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all'?

The truth is that the Psalmist is making a remarkable and illuminating suggestion. Few of our modern harvest hymns, as I have already hinted, attain the depth of our Psalmist's insight. Most of them either ignore the human element in the harvest, as though the glory of God is thereby enhanced, or else, they carefully distinguish between man's comparatively modest contribution —ploughing, sowing, and the like—and God's infinitely greater contribution through the processes of growth and increase, beyond our human wit to devise. Here is a well-known example:

> We plough the fields, and scatter
> The good seed on the land,
> *But* it is fed and watered
> By God's almighty hand.

'But,' you observe. We plough. But, God feeds and waters. It is a contrast piety so often supposes it must draw. But it is a dangerous contrast when expressed in terms like these. For it leads to a false opposition in men's minds between what is allegedly of man and what is allegedly of God; with the result that the more man does through increasing knowledge and technical equipment, the more does he tend to depreciate the part of God.

How can any thoughtful person draw such a sharp distinction between man's ploughing and scattering and God's feeding and watering, when it is man who analyses the soil and feeds it with carefully balanced foods, which are the result of long hours in the laboratory, and years in the research stations? How the distinction fades when it is remembered that man not only ploughs and scatters but builds reservoirs, diverts rivers, constructs massive concrete dams, and thereby brings vast areas of barren desert into cultivation until it blossoms as the rose!

This division of labour between man and God is dangerous religious illiteracy, which is alienating multitudes of serious people to-day.

But our Psalmist, let it be well noted, will have none of it. Twenty-five centuries ago he would have none of it! He enumerates the wonderful works of God: the creation of the earth; the separation of land and sea; the fountains and springs which enable the grass to grow for the cattle, and corn and vine and olive for man. And then he goes further. He adds to his list of the wonderful works of God all the instincts whereby bird and beast are able to avail themselves of the provisions made for them. And the culmination of his list is this urge in man, this strength, this foresight, this ability and skill, to go forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening. The Psalmist is affirming that the capacity in us to work, to plan, to invent, to harness the forces of

Nature to our purposes, is also of God ; one of His most wonderful of all works, comparable to His marvels in sun or moon or stars. Therefore, having named man's power to work, he goes on in the self-same breath, 'O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all.' ALL!

Is not this realism and insight of the Psalmist a religious philosophy of which we greatly stand in need to-day ? Religion is fighting a losing battle, and the quicker it is lost the better, if it teaches that everything man can do is on one side of the wall, and only what is still unknown and beyond man's ability is on the other side, and is the work of God. The truth is otherwise. God is equally active on both sides of the wall. Indeed, no wall exists. It is all of God, because all is the gift and endowment of God, whether it be our strength to plough and sow, or our knowledge of when and where to sow, or our increasing scientific discoveries and mechanical inventions. All this is no less of God than the revolving seasons, or the rain and sunshine which form the conventional material of our hymns. The Psalmist had the same unified thought concerning the harvest of the fields that Paul had concerning the harvest of character. 'Work out your own salvation . . . for it is God who worketh in you.'

'O Lord, how manifold are thy works ! in wisdom hast thou made them all.' Our Psalmist, with penetrating insight, counts it as the climax of the wonderful works of God that we mortals can share constructively in His designs, be co-workers with Him by His grace, going forth unto our work and to our labour, whether of mind or of muscle, until the evening. Wherefore, 'when ye glorify the Lord, exalt Him as much as ye can ; for even yet will He far exceed ; how great is He, and how greatly to be praised ; put forth all your strength, when ye exalt Him, and be not weary, for ye can never go far enough.'

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Buoyancy for Leaden Feet

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT MENZIES, D.D., GLASGOW

'The Lord God is my strength, and he will make my feet like hinds' feet, and he will make me to walk upon mine high places.'—Hab 3^{19}.

Religion has always suffered from a misunderstanding of its true nature. One of the commonest delusions is that religion in any shape or form is a dull affair. Even so discerning a writer as R. L. Stevenson in one of his letters makes the laconic comment, 'I have been to church, and am not depressed.' Most inexperienced people commit the blunder of equating religion with dullness.

That, however, is not the way that people with a genuine experience of religion either think or talk. Here is what a modern religious expert has to say about it. 'When you watch religion at work you find a morality ; when you converse with it in thoughtful mood you find a philosophy ; but when you touch the heart of religion you find a song.' The justice of this comment is confirmed by the Jewish Psalter. The Psalms are the repository of the soul of Jewry through centuries of communion with the living God. It is worth noticing that that experience is expressed neither in a philosophical system, nor dogmatic formulae, nor an ethical treatise, but in a series of matchless lyrics. 'Whenever you get to the heart of religion you always find a song.'

Consider our text for a moment. Habakkuk is the only philosopher amongst the prophets. He had a deeply reflective cast of mind, and like most men given to speculation burdened with the weary weight of this unintelligible world in which he lived. He had nothing of the buoyant temperament which might compensate others differently dowered for the tragic situation in which he was involved. Yet this melancholy man, obsessed with his lot, and prone to the dark side of things, had somehow reached to a vital experience of God, and the result transfigured his character and outlook.

The words he uses to describe this experience are a hill-man's metaphor. 'He hath made my feet like hinds' feet.' He had often watched the deer on the mountains of Judaea. What lovely creatures they were—lissom things of beauty and grace, leaping from crag to crag with the swiftness of the wind, so elastic and free in their movements. The dominant impression was one of buoyancy. It was as if they moved on springs. 'He hath made my feet like hinds' feet.' This is what a genuine experience of God does for the soul. It puts spring into one's movements. It gives a lilt to the heart and lifting power to the feet. It is what wings are to a bird or sails to a boat. 'They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength ; they shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint.'

Glance for a moment at the New Testament. Look at the life of Jesus. What impresses one is His exuberance, His inexhaustible vitality, His spaciousness of nature, His ability to deal easily and effectively with every emergent situation. 'We might have known,' says Tertullian, 'that Jesus was the Lord by His buoyancy.' Or look at His immediate followers. They seemed to share in His buoyancy. Depression and defeatism were no part of their stock-in-trade. They lived singing, winging, soaring lives. They were eager to take to the great Roman roads, to preach the good tidings of His gospel. With exhaustless energy they compassed sea and land to make one proselyte.

They had a hope for every venture, a triumph for every hindrance, a conquest for every difficulty. They could truly say, 'He hath made my feet like hinds' feet.' Now let us ask ourselves what the secret of this resiliency is. What is there in the gospel which helps a man to banish depression and live a buoyant exultant life?

(1) The first secret of buoyancy is adjustment to our proper environment. Put a scholar amongst a crowd of people without taste or knowledge and he is limited and restricted. Put a pagan amongst saints and he is in a strait-jacket and knows neither what to say nor do. Neither is in a free environment. On one occasion I visited the *Queen Mary* when she lay in dock without her engines. It was an interesting experience looking over the luxurious cabins and elegant appointments of this great liner. Six months afterwards I watched this same vessel, now engined, sailing majestically down the Clyde. In deep water she had all the grace, ease, and elasticity of a yacht. But put that lithe, athletic structure on dry land and she would instantly become a helpless mass of dead matter, inert, motionless, and useless. It was only when she was adjusted to her proper environment that she came alive, vibrant, and resilient.

We were not made to find our resting place amid the perishing things of earth. The native element of the soul of man is the deep sea of God's life. And if we do not live and have our being in the immensities of God's being, we are like a ship on dry land. Jesus restores buoyancy to human life because He plants it in the element to which it rightly belongs. He reconciles us to God. He adjusts us perfectly to His sovereign will. When we are rightly adjusted to His will, He cleanses and restores our stained lives, bears us up on the mighty tides of His life, so strengthens us with might by His spirit that our lives are lifted above depression and our feet move like hinds' feet.

(2) Again, the gospel restores our buoyancy by its power to kindle in our hearts a new hope for ourselves. Hope is one of the great springs of renewal. 'It is,' says Carlyle, 'the Constantine sign in the sky which has conquering power.' So long as hope still lives in the heart the feet will still move, but when hope dies the life within sags and becomes limp and inert. This is particularly so when we lose hope about ourselves, and are gravelled by our frequent backslidings and moral defeats. I once knew a man who imagined he was suffering from an incurable disease. As a result he lost all interest in life. His eyes became lustreless, his words mechanical, and his bodily movements slow and heavy. I persuaded him to consult a surgeon, which he reluctantly did. He expected his death sentence, but instead the surgeon said to him, 'You are a very sick man. You will need an operation, but I can guarantee a perfect cure.' The effect was electrical. He left the consulting room a transfigured personality. He squared his shoulders, his eyes sparkled, and his walk recovered its poise and elasticity. Such is the power of hope. And such is the gift of the gospel to all sin-diseased and morally defeated lives. Jesus says to us, 'You are a sick man but you need not stay the way you are. You will need an operation but I can guarantee a perfect cure.' And taking Him at His word, and putting ourselves under His surgical treatment, a new hope of spiritual health is begotten in our hearts, and with it the renewal of our lives at the fountain.

(3) The third source of buoyancy is the new love which the gospel plants in our hearts. It is love, we say, that makes the world go round. One of the big lifting powers of life is the power of romance. Study the Song of Songs in the Old Testament, and what one notices is its exuberance and lilt. The beloved's feet move like hinds' feet. 'The voice of my beloved! behold, he cometh leaping upon the mountains, skipping upon the hills. . . . Arise, my love, my fair one, and come away.' That is Nature's reaction to the love impulse. When love is born, life mounts up on wings like eagles. When love dies, life trails a broken wing. J. P. Struthers of Greenock tells how it was once his lot to read the diary of a lady into whose life had come the hope of a happy marriage. From that hour the tone of the diary changed. It was as if the sun shone through after a night of bitter wind and tempest. Then, suddenly, the darkness came down and a weeping mist. Only two words accounted for the change. 'Came not.' No need to supply nouns and adjectives. The whole tragedy and pathos of life are in these words 'Came not.'

> The mind has a thousand eyes,
> And the heart but one;
> Yet the light of a whole life dies
> When love is done.

The greatest romance in the world is to be found in the pages of the New Testament. And never once do we read there the words 'Came not.' On the contrary, like a recurring refrain, run the words, 'He came.' 'He came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance.' 'He came to give life and life with a plus.' 'He came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for the sins of the world.' And He still comes to all who seek Him. And when His love lays hold of us, He puts a new song on our lips, and with enlarged hearts we run in the way of His Commandments. 'He makes our feet like hinds' feet.'

And is it not true that it is the recovery of this spirit of buoyancy that is our sorest need to-day?

We are living in difficult times. We are depressed by the austerity of our lot, and the bleakness of the future. We are not by any count sitting on the top of the world, living singing, winging lives. And what depresses us most of all is our own spiritual condition. We are not rightly adjusted to God, and because we are not healed at the centre we live in a chronic state of tension and strain. We have allowed sin to have dominion over us, and we are rather hopeless about our moral recovery. We have become so infected by the hardness and cynicism of the world about us that love to God and man are far to seek and hard to find. What we need is a religion which will supply the requisite vitamins to our spent and exhausted lives. But as I have said these are precisely the three deficiencies which the gospel supplies, and meets in copious fashion. They are sometimes called the theological virtues—faith, hope, and love. The Greeks called them graces, but in the New Testament they are always regarded as powers, energies of the spirit. We can all have them now, as we take Christ into our hearts. And when He comes into our hearts, bringing these gifts of faith, hope, and love with Him, we shall gain the power to overcome the world without and within, to rise in triumph above all its deadening influences, and sing our exultant song, 'He will make my feet like hinds' feet, and he will make me to walk upon mine high places.'

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Where Do You Live?

BY THE REVEREND J. ADAMSON FINLAY, M.A., GLASGOW

'Where dwellest thou?'—Jn 1^{38}.

Where do you live? The question may be either geographical or spiritual. It may refer to the country, town, or street in which you reside, or to the main realm of ideas in which your mind habitually dwells; or to the temper and quality of your spirit, for as Milton puts it:

The mind is its own place, and in itself
Can make a Heaven of Hell, a Hell of Heaven.

The mind, that is to say, determines where we really dwell.

When Andrew and John asked Jesus where He was living, they were referring of course to the house in which He was staying, but they were to learn that any four walls that might house Jesus of Nazareth were only part of the answer as to where He lived.

Andrew and John went and saw where Jesus was living and remained there all day, a never-to-be-forgotten day; and as often as they recalled that day what stood out in their memory was not the character or location of the house or its furnishings, but the atmosphere that emanated from its chief occupant, of whom John long afterwards wrote: 'We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.'

The question as to where a person lives is a very important one. Let us look at one or two of its aspects. And let us note first that the most important factor in any dwelling is personality. Certainly the situation and style of a house, its architecture, its exposure, its furnishings are all important and will engage the attention of any one who has a choice in these matters; but important as these are they are nevertheless secondary, for from none of these material conditions does a dwelling draw its distinctive atmosphere. That comes from human personality.

You remember that grim book, *Wuthering Heights*, and the forbidding structure that went by that name, the very thought of which sends a chill over the spirit. Now it was not the situation or character of that house with its few stunted firs, its narrow windows and gaunt walls, that made the place so bleak and grim and terrible. What did that was the sinister character of Heathcliffe who lived there and whose personality cast a blight over everything. If you could have put into *Wuthering Heights* an occupant of another kind with a personality full of grace and generous impulses then all would have been different; the very gauntness of the building would have taken on a certain dignity, the very bleakness of the situation a charm of its own.

Personality makes or mars any dwelling, touching it with warmth, enfolding it in peace, and giving to its portals an unmistakable atmosphere of welcome, or else investing it with a repellent coldness and indefinable sense of unrest, so that one would never think of ringing its door-bell except from necessity.

The two disciples who followed Jesus that day tell us nothing of the house where Jesus dwelt, what it looked like, how it was furnished. What impressed them and lingered in their memory was Jesus Himself and the spirit He radiated in that house. If, therefore, you would have a happy, worthy dwelling, you must give attention not only to your house's furnishings but above all to your own spirit, remembering that the most important factor in any dwelling is personality.

We must further remember that the most important element in personality is love. Not cleverness, of which there is a plentiful supply in the world, not cleverness, for a person may be clever and callous; not efficiency, for efficiency can be as sharp as the east wind; not strength,

for strength can be unthinking enough; but the most important element in any personality is love which touches all with blessing.

Love is the greatest power in the lives of men. Nothing unifies and illumines a personality as love does. A person may be able, industrious, ambitious, and yet his moral life may be a thing of shreds and patches, but let love be present and it harmonizes all within.

And nothing conveys blessing to others as love does. How good it is to meet a person whose heart has been warmed by the love of God and who is kind without being conscious of it! The strong, the brave, the learned we may admire, but the kind heart and the loving face we love.

Robert Louis Stevenson, giving its true stamp to a true home, wrote:

Home was home then, my dear, full of kindly faces,
Home was home then, my dear, happy for the child,

happy from its pervasive atmosphere of love. That was a fine thing one of John Buchan's sons said of his father, 'Everything at home sprang into cheerful new life the moment my father entered the front door.' And part of John Buchan's secret may be found in the observation of a friend regarding him: 'The foundation of his life, I realize now, was the principle of Christian love.'

Now the love that crowns personality is found pre-eminently in the fellowship of Jesus. One of the two men who went to see Jesus that day and who spent much time in His company became one of the kindest hearts in the Roman world. Tradition has it, and here one feels tradition may be safely trusted, that John drew the young toward him by the breadth and generosity of his personality, a breadth and generosity he had learned from Jesus. As John grew to be an old man, so the tradition goes, he would often say, 'Little children, love one another,' and when asked why he always said that and nothing else, he replied, 'Because nothing else is necessary; love is the fulfilling of the law.' John the much-loved disciple had caught the spirit of his Master and in that spirit he continued to live.

The love of Jesus, what it is
None but His loved ones know.

Wherefore, if you would have a kindly heart, a generous nature that rises above the petty tempers of life, seek often to be in the company of Jesus. Living with Him can change a person from being hasty and censorious into being patient, gentle, and kind, and such a spirit can make any dwelling a true home.

Dwellings are not most truly classified as rich or poor, luxurious or plain, but as homes where peace is or homes from which peace is absent—the peace that flows from personality illumined and warmed by love.

Where do you live? It is an important question. The postman knows where you reside; but in your heart of hearts you know where you live. Is it a dwelling lit by love or darkened by selfishness? Is it a place of peace or of unrest? Is your heart such that you would hesitate to invite Jesus to enter it? If it is, then your greatest need is to do just that—invite Him into your heart. 'Come into my heart, Lord Jesus.' Then will life be made new for you, for the love of God will be shed abroad in your heart, your personality will be suffused by the winsome love of Jesus, and wherever you live joy and peace will spring up.

Gracious Spirit, dwell with me!
I myself would gracious be;
And, with words that help and heal,
Would Thy life in mine reveal.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Canker of Self

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR NORMAN H. SNAITH, D.D., WESLEY COLLEGE, LEEDS

'For even Christ pleased not himself.'—Ro 15^{3}.

The Apostle is laying down the guiding principle of Christian conduct, a subject which he discusses also in 1 Co 10^{23}–11^{1}. In each case he has but one rule, and also in each case he bases all he has to say on the character and conduct of Christ (cf. Ro 15^{3} and 1 Co 11^{1}). It is that a man must seek not his own, but his fellow-man's good. The rule is, in the first degree, negative: do not do that which will weaken your fellow-man. In the second degree it is positive: do that which will strengthen him.

This is all of the utmost importance in these days, because of two classes of people. One class is composed of people who hold that they have a perfect right to please themselves what they do, and that they are accountable to nobody. Such claims are an affront to any theory of society. All who hold them are enemies of civilization at least as certainly as any Ishmael, ancient or modern. Such opinions are the development of the sinful psychology of the half-educated, according to whom a man's first duty is to develop his own personality and express his whole self; and this from the cradle to the grave. 'Baby knows best.' The second class consists of well-meaning and sincere people who honestly try to order their actions by definite moral standards of right and wrong. If an action is not morally bad ('lawful' [1 Co 10^{23}]), then it is permissible. If it is morally bad, then it

is not permissible. Such criteria might barely be possible for the Christian, except that in practice the question which is asked is ' Is this action lawful *in itself* ? ' This was the decisive question asked in the recent study of modern gambling by various members of the Church Assembly. For the Christian, there is no such thing as ' an action *in itself*,' because the Christian has to remember that not all lawful things are expedient, that is, permissible to him as a Christian. The Christian knows that he is a member of a special community. Any member of a human society has no business to seek his own ' good ' (lasting benefit or passing entertainment) without considering its reaction on his fellow-men. As a member of a human society he must not act in such fashion as would injure his fellow-man. As a member of a Divine society, he must do all things to the glory of God, and to the ' edifying ' (building up, strengthening) of his fellow-man.

The position of the first class (those who act patently for themselves) is obviously and plainly vitiated by the canker of self. They are unashamedly, and even boastfully, selfish. They see no reason why they should be otherwise. But the position of the second group is also vitiated by this canker of self, though this is not in the least obvious to them themselves. They are honest, sincere, well-meaning. Often they are highly moral, sedulously guarding their own souls from moral fault. Their question is : ' Is this action lawful for me ?,' and at root there is always this self-reference. Even their morality is rooted in selfishness. This is how it has come about that, in time past (and perhaps in this present time also), there have been honest, sincere, devoutly Christian men who have been strictly moral in their own personal lives, and yet have seen nothing amiss in the shocking social conditions of other people who have been financially less fortunate than themselves. No one doubts their high morality, but we can see now that their social sense was mostly missing. It was because of this that some of the Earl of Shaftesbury's most violent opponents were highly moral Christian men. The same is true of all those instances where Christian reformers have had to fight against opposition within the churches almost equally as with opposition without the churches. The trouble is the canker of self, busy all the time even in the lives of highly moral people, steadily eating away the soul.

All this, as I find it, can be understood best by an analysis of the meaning of the word Love. In English this word has to do duty for a whole range of emotions, from the purest to the filthiest. I often wish, like the Greeks, we had three separate words for it, if only that we might be able clearly to distinguish between three different types of love, distinctions which, as I hold, it is essential for the sound Christian to recognize.

The second class of people whom I have mentioned (moral, well-meaning, honest people) at their lowest are moral isolationists, but at the best belong to the group which to-day are commonly called ' men of good-will.' They believe in Give and Take, at their best, that is. This is the Greek *philia*. They hold that if only we can establish Give and Take in this world, we shall have a model society. They are right. This Give and Take is the true ideal of human society. It is on this *philia* that the would-be makers of modern democracy depend. It is on this *philia* that all those depend who believe that social salvation comes through good laws, good education, good environment, those who hold that by these means we can harness scientific knowledge to the further advance of civilization. The great modern question is : Can this be done ? To put it another way : Is *philia* strong enough, and effective enough amongst men to produce this result ?

I hold that all hopes of the establishment of a true human society on the basis of *philia* are vitiated by this canker of self. Right at the root of human nature, inherent in it, main dynamic of the evolutionary process, there is another kind of love, the kind of love which the Greeks called *eros*. This *eros* is self-love. It can be cultured, highly aesthetic, and truly ethical in the individualist pattern of our second class. It can be sensuous, vulgar, greedy, and immoral. But whether moral or immoral, cultured or vulgar, its roots are in self-love. It is this self-love which at length breaks up every attempt to build a new world on the basis of *philia* alone. Further, this cultured *eros*, with its reaching out to the highest and the best, is the most deadly enemy of *philia*, if only because our first human reaction is to react violently and offendedly against this very statement. Ugly and vicious self-love is rightly deprecated by all right-thinking men and women. It is easy to do this, partly because it is so obviously immoral and unpleasant, but partly also because it is the form which self-love takes in people other than ourselves. The more deadly *eros* belongs to us all, perhaps more frequently in suburbia and in intelligentsia than in what are called the ' lower ' parts of the town. Who is there of us who cannot see most plainly corruption and self-seeking in the political party to which we ourselves do not belong, or in those classes of society with which we do not identify ourselves ?

But there is a third type of love, which the New Testament calls *agape*. This *agape* is a Bible word, invented by the first Greek translators of the Old Testament. New Testament writers used it to express Christian love. It stands in the first place

for God's love to man, and in the second place for man's love for his fellow-man when 'the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us.' This love is essentially an unselfish love, one which 'seeketh not its own.' This is the love which caused Christ to empty Himself and become of no reputation. This is the love because of which His arms are open wide to welcome every repentant sinner. Only thus can *eros* be cast out of the human heart. Its place must be taken by *agape*. There is no other cure for the canker of self.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Unqualified Praise

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR A. COWAN, D.D., EDINBURGH

'I will praise thee, O Lord, with my whole heart.'—Ps 9[1].

Human nature is sometimes inclined to be secretly querulous, and every one would not appreciate the Divine succour so thoroughly as the Psalmist. Mrs. Browning remarked, 'Some people always say "Thank God!" with a sigh,' as if they were hinting a criticism of Him and making a plaintive suggestion that Providence might have managed things better. To be sure, they are grateful for the recovery of their health and safety, but they infer that prevention is preferable to cure, and they cannot repress a sigh at the memory of their trouble. They would be more satisfied with God if He had averted it, and they are not whole-hearted, they cannot give Him unqualified praise.

Such fretful folk either cannot or will not understand that even God does not have life without tears and does not enjoy the immunity from painful experiences which too many expect as the proof of His love. The Christian religion makes it very clear that God Himself suffers from a bedevilled world and bears the brunt of its wicked disorder, for did not His Son die upon a Cross of agony? The sacrifice on Calvary is conclusive evidence that Divine mercy is taking more than its share of the hardship, distress, and tragedy of the human story and redeeming it with such ungrudging love that we can have nothing but praise for it. We feel under such an unpayable debt to God that we begin to see how generous and glorious He is. Then we go all out in thanksgiving, as the Psalmist did. He sang with complete gratitude and unreserved confidence. 'I will praise thee, O Lord, with my whole heart.'

But it may be objected that this jubilant worshipper was not facing the modern predicament, or he might have changed his tune. He was on the top of his form, because he had got what he wanted. His enemies had been routed and the menace of things had been removed by a mighty act of God, and he rang all the bells and sounded all the trumpets in the cheering streets. He gave unqualified praise, and so would we, if we were in his happy position. But alas! we have not got what we wanted, and after winning the War we are still threatened by formidable enemies to our peace and progress. We feel disappointed and frustrated, and now rearmament is a commanding necessity which has imposed on us further restrictions and privations. Our darling desires and our pet dreams are choked by the tensions of the time, and people chafe at being forced to slave away at unwelcome forms of work which do not seem to be getting them anywhere. It galls them to be prevented from living their own life and finding scope for their natural bent and their special aptitude. It is aggravating to be so cramped. This is the modern predicament which mutes the blithe note of thanksgiving and makes the Psalmist's praise sound overdone.

Well, was it merely a chirpy optimism which prompted Emerson's dictum: 'To-day is a king in disguise: let us unmask the king as he passes!'? Perhaps behind the veil of a forbidding time some ruling truth has come to claim us and lift us into a higher future. Who knows but that this disconcerting day may be a royal opportunity, which will sicken us of evil, put nobler resolves into us, and invest us with some moral distinction? Let us not despise the kingly call to be victors and not victims. Henry James warns us: 'Most forms of contempt are unwise, but one is particularly ridiculous: contempt for the age one lives in.' You see, a man may be absurd, he may be fooling himself as to where his fitness lies, and frustration there may carry him to fulfilment elsewhere. There is an unexpected vision, a neglected capacity, an unutilized resource, to which his eyes must be opened, if he is to come to his best. He is not being disinherited but developed when he is pushed on to hit a new trail and break fresh ground. A king in disguise is confronting him, and he must unmask the king ere he passes, and gladly go with him into his kingdom.

Take a famous instance of such discovery and victory in a tantalizing situation. When Michael-angelo was summoned by Pope Julius II to leave his superb chiselling and carry out the pictorial decoration of the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel at the Vatican, he protested that he was a sculptor, not a painter. Raphael was a painter, why not get him to do the job? So dismayed was Michael-angelo at having this work imposed on him that he wrote a sonnet to convince the world that

painting was not his line. He begged the Pope to excuse him, but in vain, and then he threw himself into the enforced task with the fury of faith ; and lo and behold ! his paintings on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel were his crowning achievement, the masterpiece of his genius. The work took him four and a half years, during which he toiled terribly. The Pope forgot to defray expenses till at last reminded by the desperate artist, who was meanwhile harassed by family troubles and accused by his relatives of living luxuriously at Rome and neglecting his poor old father and needy brothers. Here was the black misery of frustration, but it was lit up by the flame of religious passion, unqualified praise of the God unheeded by a degenerate civilization. At last the magnificent frescoes were finished, with their two hundred gigantic figures and one hundred and fifty smaller figures, which related the Bible story of sin, judgment, repentance, and the coming of Christ. The Sistine Chapel still shakes the careless with its tremendous vision of God in action—the vision which raised Michaelangelo to his full height and changed a compulsory task into a supreme opportunity of seeing and making others see the march of the Divine purpose. Thus the torment of coercive circumstances, which exclude us from our favourite inclinations and pursuits, may turn out a happy surprise, and set us to work which far excels the work we set ourselves. If we keep believing hearts, upsetting events can rouse us to our best, and force us to our deepest insight and our greatest service to the world.

This is a reassurance to the wistful, but it is also a rebuke to the self-centred. A doctor writing in a Sunday paper gives the severe diagnosis that people are strained, keyed-up to-day because they want too much and are growing more selfish. They are fidgety, nervous, out of sorts, because they will not deny themselves anything. What they need, to be healthy, is to be saved from themselves. Think of the schemers, go-getters, and self-seekers, who are determined to do themselves well—would you really like to change places with them ? In his book, *Famous and Infamous Cases*, Patrick Hastings describes certain insatiable and unbridled persons who underwent State trials and who were the sensation of their time, and this is how he concludes : ' The puppets that have looked at me from the historical stage upon which they walked have been much akin to all the other puppets I have known. Sometimes they have made me smile—sometimes they have touched my heart—sometimes they have even made me cry. But, have they taught me anything ? I have been driven to the view that the only human being whose life-story leaves behind him anything of lasting value is one who leaves a memory of lovingkindness.' It is striking that the Lord Chief Justice was *driven* to this view, compelled by his legal experience of sordid egotism to recognize the truth that we are here to serve, and he closes by telling the reader to ask himself : ' Have I been the slightest use to anybody ? ' Those who refuse to be crossed have reason to feel relieved and thankful when they are forcibly succoured by events from their worship of number one, which might have missed the splendour of knowing and doing something that lasts. How glad they are afterwards that their selfish detachment was interrupted by the demand for sacrifice ! Simon of Cyrene had to carry the Cross willy-nilly, however he might protest that it was inconvenient and exasperating and that he had other urgent plans, but it was his encounter with salvation, his discovery of what it costs to redeem misguided humans, his meeting with God. It brought him alongside Christ, and gave him a share in the Divine ransom of the captives of evil. He had been enlisted in a service of permanent and incomparable worth. Would he have preferred to be left out and remain snug and useless ? No, he was glad and thankful to be included in the Divine purpose of saving love. ' I will praise thee, O Lord, with my whole heart.'

People must not let themselves be blinded and disabled by bitterness, because life has thwarted them. That is to be spiritually unintelligent and spiritually unfit. It can be stopped only by self-commitment to Christ, who reconciles us with God's purpose, brings us into personal relations with God, and makes us certain of an over-ruling Providence turning our pains into gains. If we are in touch with Christ, God will compel our attention by His unexpectedness and sufficiency in every discouragement, and impress us increasingly as the unconquerable Love which cannot be put off the map, but outlives the upheavals and problems of every age, and revives us with His eternal freshness. Knowing and serving Him through Christ, we belong to the everlasting Reality which cannot be displaced by any shock of change. The Rationalist Press Association expressed regret that the Christian religion showed no sign of surrender, however violently assailed. ' Blown sky-high to-day, it presents an unbroken and smiling front to-morrow. No other religion, be it remembered, is subjected to anything like the same ordeal. It is the survival of Christianity in the realistic atmosphere of the West that is such an amazing and impressive phenomenon.' If we are in this enduring cause, then we can count ourselves among the undefeated, because the Divine mercy is carrying us through, and that is ground for unqualified praise. We should let ourselves go in triumphant song, because the God made manifest in Christ towers ' o'er the wrecks of time ' in a devastated

world. Worshippers turn to God as the unfailing power of repair in a wasted scene where lesser gods seem spent and futile. Karl Barth asks: 'Is it not true that, when people come to church, they consciously or unconsciously leave behind cherry-tree, symphony, state, daily work, and other things, as possibilities somehow exhausted? The situation in worship is related to *the end of history*, the ultimate desire of man for Him who overcomes the world.' So when other helps have dashed our hopes, and we feel that we have been badly let down, it is the God and Father of Jesus Christ who rallies and restores us with His victorious power. That is why we are so thoroughly thankful to Him, and give Him unqualified praise. 'I will praise thee, O Lord, with my whole heart.'

Temple or Shrine?

By the Reverend G. Lacey May, M.A., Winchester.

I

A grievous disservice is done to Bible students in that, whereas the New Testament Greek has two distinct words for a temple or house of God, both A.V. and R.V. can find but one English word with which to translate them—namely, *temple*. This sad narrowness of vocabulary gives wrong impressions to the ordinary reader, who thereby entirely misses the delicacy and significance of meaning with which the original writers used their words.

Both ναός and ἱερόν are translated *temple*, although they refer to wholly distinct things. Ναός (a word derived from ναίω, to dwell) always means the inner shrine in which God is spoken of as especially dwelling, whilst ἱερόν as regularly refers to the whole sacred enclosure, in which the ναός stands, with its outer courts and subsidiary buildings.

This distinction between the two Greek words stands firm not only in the Septuagint, but also in classical Greek; and it is highly interesting to trace their history and significance.

II

Ἱερός, of course, means *holy* or *dedicated*. This word was doubtlessly used for holy ground (as in Ex 3[5]) long before the conception grew of a visible habitation for deities. Indeed, a third word, τέμενος (often used as an equivalent to ἱερόν), may have been earlier than ἱερόν since, derived from τέμνω, to cut, it signified a cutting or clearance. Thaddeus Zielinski, in his *Religion of Ancient Greece*, reminds us that the temple probably evolved out of the sacred grove. 'At first men formed an arbour by intertwining its trees, thus providing a shelter for the statue . . .; later they thought it more secure to build a small house among the trees, and finally they transformed this house and the trees that surrounded it into a building wholly or in part of stone: thus arose the cella and its colonnade, the form of "Greek temple" that we all know, simple but majestic and enchanting.' To provide this ἱερόν or holy place in which to place the ναός and its image, a τέμενος or cutting on some (generally) wooded high place or promontory would first have to be made—the natural order, in the course of events, being τέμενος—ἱερόν—ναός (with its εἰκων).

The distinction of meaning in these three words is regularly observed in classical writings, such as the history of Thucydides [1] and the great Greek tragedies. In Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*, for instance, the old blind king (like a forerunner of King Lear!) arrives with his daughters at Colonus, a village near Athens, and rests at a certain spot overlooking the city. The wearied old man seats himself upon a rough-hewn stone. But soon a wayfarer, and shortly after a deputation from Colonus, arrive to bid him leave so sacred a spot, which is the 'seat, ἕδρα or haunt of the dreaded Eumenides or Furies, and where (they tell him) the whole place is ἱερός.' But sacred and awesome as the place is, there is no sign here of a ναός or built-up shrine.

Especially in Herodotus [2] is the ναός always distinctly marked as the dwelling-place or shrine of the god, whilst ἱερόν is its precincts or larger (but less important) buildings. Thus the historian tells us that when Persians defeated the Milesians at Didyme they burnt both the temple (ἱερόν) and the shrine (ναός) (vi. 19). The same exactness is found in Josephus, VIII. iii. 9, where he says of King Solomon, Ναῶν δ' ἔξωθεν ἱερὸν ᾠκοδόμησεν τετραγώνῳ σχήματι ('outside the shrine he built a temple') and goes on to describe the courts and cloisters of the latter.

It is difficult to mark in English the distinction of the two words: but even at the risk of shocking old-fashioned readers (who anyhow ought not to be allowed to rest in their present confusion in reading Bible passages) might not ἱερόν be regularly translated as *temple*, and ναός as *shrine*? The difficulty in this would be that the word *temple* has grown to mean almost exclusively the

[1] *E.g.*, Thuc. iv. 90; v. 18.

[2] Cf. also i. 181, 183; ii. 112, 155; iii. 142.

House of God, whilst the word *shrine* means very little to the modern mind. Well, if this use is considered undesirable, why should not ναός be *temple*, and ἱερόν be *temple precincts*?

The Latin equivalents of these two words are *templum* (possibly derived from the same root as τέμενος), meaning the precincts cleared for God's abode, and *adytum* (the unapproachable place), meaning the shrine. The distinction is wonderfully marked in such magnificent remains of Greek temples as are found on the Athenian Acropolis or at Paestum in Italy. In these fine buildings what impels instant admiration are the majestic columns which surround the shrine. These are *not* the shrine. They are a glorious fence which welcomes the surrounding sunshine and softens it into mysterious shadow round the much smaller shrine which stands within them. Just so was the Temple at Jerusalem, a comparatively small building, never entered by ordinary worshippers, but surrounded by magnificent terraces, courts and colonnades to the whole of which our English Bible gives the name of 'the Temple.'

III

When we recognize that this distinction between ἱερόν and ναός is regularly observed not only by the writers whom we have mentioned, but also by both Old Testament and New Testament, in the Septuagint, and by all competent Greek scholars (such as R. C. Jebb and Sir Gilbert Murray), we realize how much deeper insight might be given to the meaning of many Scripture passages by the recognition.

A few instances will suffice to show this. For instance, nowhere in the Gospels is it said or suggested that our Lord ever entered the Holy Place. As a layman, He could not do so. His teachings 'in the Temple' were given in its outer courts. Zacharias, on the other hand, on entering 'the Temple to burn incense,' passed as a priest into the Holy Place, whilst the great congregation, waiting for his reappearance, stayed outside in the ἱερόν, the court which surrounded the Holy of Holies and the Holy Place. So the great altar of burnt offerings stood not in the Holy Place (though this contained the Table of Shewbread and the altar of incense), but stood in the court in front of the Holy Place, where all the congregation could see it. The relative positions are indicated in Mt 23^{35}, where we are told that the Old Testament prophet Zachariah was slain 'between the ναός and the altar'—that is, in the open court.

To return to our Lord's teaching—when He mentions 'blind guides' who 'swear by the gold of the Temple,' and spoke (as false witnesses did later) of His 'destroying this temple' (by which St. John says He meant His own body), the word used is ναός or shrine. At His death, too, it was the veil of the ναός which was rent—either that between the Holy of Holies and the Holy Place, or that between the latter and the court outside. On the other hand, the word ἱερόν is, in every case, used when Mary found her Son 'sitting in the Temple,' when we read that Anna 'departed not from the temple . . . night and day,' and when our Lord drove traders 'out of the temple.'

Once only the distinction between ναός and ἱερόν seems possibly blurred or mistaken. We read (Mt 27^{5}) that in his fit of remorse Judas 'cast down the pieces of silver in the temple'; surprisingly the word here is not ἱερόν but ναός, into which only priests were admitted. But *is* this a mistake? Archbishop Trench [1] points out that the act is made more tragic if in his desperation he actually penetrated into the Holy Place to throw his hateful money before priests there. Or may he not at least have drawn the curtain (without actually entering) to hurl the coins into that chamber?

IV

Readers may follow up this article, if they will, by tracing the usual distinction between Shrine and outer Temple (ναός and ἱερόν) in the Acts and the remaining New Testament books. The distinction is maintained throughout the Acts. It was, of course, in the court of the Temple that the cripple begged for alms (3^{2}); and of these outside courts (including the sacrificial altar) St. Paul is speaking when he writes that 'they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple.' It was from these courts that he was thrust (21^{30}) by angry Jews on a false charge. But throughout the Apocalypse, which so clearly deals in images of the living God in His heavenly habitation, we are not surprised to find that ναός is invariably used.

Finally, it may be helpful to point out the great significance of the fact that our Lord, speaking of His own body as 'the Temple,' used the word ναός—the habitation in which God dwelt; and that St. Paul, in urging (1 Co 3^{16}) that the body of a Christian is 'a (not *the*) temple (ναός) of God,' [2] is continuing our Lord's teaching that God the Holy Spirit can dwell (what a purifying and humbling thought) in a sanctified human body as in a shrine!

[1] In his valuable little book, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, from which I have freely drawn much for this article.

[2] R.V. makes the necessary correction 'a body,' as against 'the body' of A.V.

Contributions and Comments

The Son of Man

In this note I wish to indicate that Otto's treatment of the term 'Son of Man' in his *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* is worthy of more detailed consideration than generally seems to be given to it. My contention is that Otto's reference to the idea of the 'fravashi' should be taken seriously (p. 389 ff.). This idea attempts an explanation in mythical terms of the riddle to which Dr. Black refers (The Expository Times, lx. 14), *i.e.*, how the union of Enoch with the Son of Man takes place. This riddle is as inexplicable in rational terms as is the 'how' of the Incarnation. I would suggest that the implications of the former are as important as are the implications of the latter, *i.e.*, the Incarnation presents the fact that in some unexplained way God became man in the Person of Jesus Christ, while the idea of the 'fravashi' presents the fact that the man Jesus Christ returned to the Godhead. The idea of the 'fravashi' also offers a mythical explanation as to how the historical Jesus became the pre-existent heavenly Messiah (cf. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 229).

It would seem that Otto's general position that Jesus' use of the term 'Son of Man' was based on the Similitudes of Enoch follows quite naturally from the acceptance of this idea of the 'fravashi.' The crucial text—'You are the Son of Man' (En 71^{14}) no longer requires emendation. If this idea is rejected, then Otto's position is open to the criticism which it has so frequently received. His position can still be accepted if we insist, as I think we must, that Jesus was not wholly dependent upon the Similitudes of Enoch but gave His own original interpretation of the term 'Son of Man.' For such interpretation there is no need to go beyond His view that the Son of Man should suffer.

I consider that in spite of Professor Manson's excellent treatment in *The Teaching of Jesus*, the term 'Son of Man' as used by Jesus is singular rather than collective. However, his analysis of the occurrences of the term in the Synoptic Gospels is most valuable, and I find it strange that so little reference is made to that analysis by later writers on the subject. There seems to be no obvious reason, however, why Professor Manson's use of the vernacular expression '*hahu gabra*' to explain some of the occurrences could not be greatly extended. If the use of 'Son of Man' as a circumlocution for 'I' is valid in some instances, why not in every possible instance? Also there are some occasions when the term could be taken to refer to somebody other than Jesus. There appears, therefore, to be some ambiguity here (cf. *The Beginnings of Christianity*, i. 378). I would stress this ambiguity and suggest that in most of the Synoptic occurrences the term 'Son of Man' can be taken *either* as a circumlocution for 'I,' *or* as referring to somebody other than Jesus. In other words, when the disciples and others heard Jesus speak of the Son of Man, they could never be quite certain whether He was referring to Himself, or to the heavenly figure of the Son of Man.

This ambiguity may be considered in terms of what Kierkegaard has called 'indirect communication'—Jesus 'to an *absent* person cannot make a direct communication. To a person who was *present* he might well say it directly, because a person on the spot, beholding the speaker, this individual man, and because of the contradiction involved in his appearance, would not in fact receive a direct communication' (*Training in Christianity*, 96 f.). If Kierkegaard's view of 'indirect communication' is accepted the implication is that Jesus in using the term 'Son of Man' was speaking about Himself. His hearers would, however, understand that He was either speaking of somebody else, or that He was using a circumlocution for 'I.' Not on any occasion, then, according to the Synoptic Gospels, did Jesus directly identify Himself with the heavenly figure of the Son of Man. His speech was at all times ambiguous or indirect. Along these lines it may be possible to draw a parallel between Jesus' use of 'Son of Man' and the 'Messianic Secret' (cf. Otto, *op. cit.*, 192, 'The world does not learn his secret; as Son of Man he is hidden from the world . . . it was not the part of the Son of Man to reveal himself').

The foregoing gives a possible answer to Professor Campbell's three questions regarding the term 'Son of Man' (*Journal of Theological Studies*, xlviii. 145). (1) In the Gospels it is never used except by Jesus Himself; (2) No one seems to find Jesus' use of the term surprising; (3) The Church made no use of the term.

(1) If 'Son of Man' was regarded as a circumlocution for 'I' then it could not have been used when referring to others. Or if Jesus was not regarded as the Son of Man during His lifetime, references to the Son of Man would not be connected with Jesus by the Synoptic writers and would not be likely to appear in the Synoptic Gospels.

(2) If references to the Son of Man were on

many lips while Jesus was alive then references by Him would be expected, and their omission would be more likely to cause surprise (cf. Otto's description of Jesus as an itinerant Galilean preacher, *op. cit.*, 13).

(3) If Jesus' use of the term was misunderstood then many years may have elapsed before the term was rightly understood to apply to Jesus. In the instance of its use outside the Gospels (Ac 7^{56}) it is probable that Stephen said he saw the Son of Man, but that *v.* 55, which connects Jesus with the Son of Man, is the author's introduction to Stephen's last words, and does not represent the view of those who witnessed Stephen's death.

When this view of the Son of Man is applied to the Fourth Gospel the results are interesting:

(1) As in the Synoptic Gospels there are some instances where the term contains some ambiguity, *i.e.*, 1^{51} $6^{27.53}$ 12^{23} 13^{31}. In the last two cases, however, there is a less indirect reference to Jesus as being Himself the Son of Man.

(2) There is one instance (12^{34}) where, by refusing to answer directly the question 'who is this Son of Man,' Jesus could be understood as not to be referring to Himself. If 'Son of Man' were substituted for 'I' in *v.* 32 the question would be more relevant to the immediate context.

(3) There can be little doubt that in many cases Jesus did directly identify Himself with the Son of Man, for example, $3^{13f.}$ 5^{27} 6^{62} 8^{28}.

It would follow then that by the time the Fourth Gospel was written the identification of Jesus with the Son of Man had been made directly. It may be that the Fourth Evangelist was the first to fully understand that the identification was true.

There may be a reference to the idea of the 'fravashi' in 3^{13}, if the words 'which is in heaven' are retained. These words imply that the Son of Man is in heaven and in earth at one and the same time, and this implication is contained in the idea of the 'fravashi.'

If the foregoing treatment is accepted it may be concluded that there is more evidence for Otto's general position than has generally been admitted by New Testament scholars.

D. Y. Archibald

Urana, New South Wales, Australia

A Suggested Exegesis of Matthew iii. 9, 10 (=Luke iii. 8, 9)

Is there a closer connexion of thought than is sometimes suggested between τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ and τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων? Ῥίζα, like its Hebrew equivalent שֹׁרֶשׁ, can bear a metaphorical meaning, as in Is 11^{1}. If this exegesis is justified, the Baptist's reply to the Jews' boast that they sprang from the stock of Abraham is that reliance upon their genealogical tree is vain, and that that tree, the stem of Abraham, is even now in danger from the axe.

D. S. Wallace-Hadrill

Aldenham, Herts

Recent Foreign Theology

The Protevangelium. Professor J. Coppens, of Louvain, has given us a new fruit of his industry in the form of an elaborate discussion of the exegesis of Gn. 3^{15}, in which some of his fellow Roman Catholics have found indications of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption.[1] With great patience and skill the author traverses all the arguments for the various interpretations of the verse and maintains a messianic interpretation but holds that the seed of the woman is male and therefore not the Virgin Mary, and hence in so far as she is referred to it must be in the woman and not in the seed. Here he resorts to the concept of corporate personality, familiar to English readers from the work of Wheeler Robinson and others, and argues that the figure of the woman in this verse may have a general and a particular significance, and therefore the Virgin Mary cannot be altogether excluded, but may be indicated as the Mother of the Seed *par excellence*, in whom the Vanquisher of the Serpent will be found. While, therefore, Fr. Coppens finds a reference to the Mother of our Lord in this verse, he dissociates himself from those who 'believe themselves able to deduce from this text almost the whole of Mariology,' and in particular rejects the claim to find the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption here. The whole argument is addressed primarily to Roman Catholic readers, but is not without interest for others.

[1] *Le Protévangile : un nouvel essai d'exégèse* [1950]. Beyaert, Bruges.

The Mercy and Justice of God. From the ever active Swedish School there has issued a study of God's mercy and justice, which is devoted mainly to the Pharisaic idea of the two measures which God uses.[2] The book is written by H. Ljungman in Swedish, but there is a short summary in English at the end. The author opens with a dis-

[2] *Guds barmhärtighet och dom : Fariséernas lära om de två 'mått'en'* [1950]. Gleerup, Lund; Kr. 9.

cussion of the use of the word *middah = measure* in the Bible and later literature and then turns to his particular subject of the mercy and justice of God. His main contention is that mercy and justice are not two opposing qualities of God, whereof the one acts to modify and balance the other, but rather that in the teaching of the Rabbis ' mercy is one side of that of which the other is God's judgment . . . and it is justice that connects the one side with the other.' Mercy and judgment thus form a unity, and in that unity justice is invariably expressed. The whole study rests on a considerable knowledge of the post-Biblical material, though the author recognizes that others who have made a thorough study of the material, including his fellow Swedish scholar Sjöberg, and so distinguished a Jewish scholar as Israel Abrahams, have reached a different conclusion. The reviewer is doubtful how far it is possible to find any rigidly defined and uniform view amongst Rabbinical writers, whose arguments were more often psychological than logical, and whose theology was unsystematic. The study may be commended for its attention to less recognized sides of that theology.

The History of Israel. Professor Martin Noth, of Bonn, who is one of the most outstanding figures in German Old Testament scholarship to-day, has published a volume on the History of Israel, which is sure to take its place immediately as an important work.[1] The author has published some earlier studies on the Israelite twelve tribe system, in which he sees something comparable with the Greek amphictyony, based on a central sanctuary, and it is to be expected that this should colour his treatment here. After a general introduction on the land and the background of its history down to 1200 B.C. he deals with this subject and with the conquest of Canaan. From this he works back to the Exodus and the patriarchal period before returning to the establishment of the Covenant and the forward movement of the history. Relatively little attention is paid to the period of the monarchy, but the treatment of the post-exilic period is good. On chronological questions it is to be noted that the Israelite conquest is placed at about 1200 B.C., while Ezra is placed before Nehemiah in the reign of Artaxerxes I (in agreement with the view of all German scholars, but in disagreement with that of a large number of others). The Samaritan schism is placed, with Josephus, at the end of the fourth century B.C., and Professor Noth observes that this offers a strong reason for dating the work of the Chronicler about 300 B.C., since it is probable that it lay after that schism. The book is throughout fully up-to-date, and much recent discovery that does not figure in similar handbooks is here taken into account, including the Egyptian execration texts and the Mari texts. The work can be warmly commended to the attention of all readers.

[1] *Geschichte Israels* [1950]. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht ; Göttingen.

German Commentaries on the Old Testament. Dr. A. Weiser, one of the two editors of the series *Das Alte Testament Deutsch*, has published a commentary on the Psalms in two volumes in the series.[2] The first contains the Introduction and the commentary on Ps 1–60, while the second contains the commentary on the rest of the Psalms. In accordance with the plan of the series an original translation of the text is given, followed by a short running commentary. Textual emendations are very sparingly made, and for their justification the reader is often referred to Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*. The Introduction is excellent and in harmony with modern trends in Psalm study. There is a good treatment of the types of the Psalms, and a valuable study of the relation of the Psalms to the cultus. The commentary itself is both scholarly and practical, and it may be commended to all who would have access to the fruits of the latest scholarship, without the minutiae of the processes whereby they are grown. The change of climate that has come over the study of the Psalms in the last generation is perhaps greater than in the case of any other book of the Old Testament.

A German Catholic series of commentaries, known as the *Echter-Bibel*, is also in progress, of which the Old Testament editor is Professor F. Nötscher, one of the ablest of all living German Catholic scholars. He has now issued a short commentary on Joshua and Judges in this series.[3] Here, again, a new translation of the text is offered, with somewhat more attention to text-critical matters than in the above-mentioned work. For here the evidence is given in a short critical apparatus that stands beneath the text, instead of referring the reader elsewhere. The commentary is brief and up-to-date, and stands under the text, instead of alternating with it as in *Das Alte Testament Deutsch*. The author assigns the fall of Jericho in one place to about 1500 B.C., but in another to 1500 or 1400 B.C. The earlier of these dates can scarcely be sustained, and not a few scholars, including the great Dominican scholar Père Vincent, think the later date is still too early. In general the commentary is well informed and reliable and likely to be widely useful.

[2] *Die Psalmen*, I : *Psalm* 1–60 [1950], and *Die Psalmen*, II : *Psalm* 61–150 [1950]. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen.

[3] *Josua und Richter* [1950]. Echter Verlag, Würzburg.

The day of large-scale commentaries would appear to be past, if only by reason of paper shortage and the costs of production, and the writers of the shorter commentaries of these series are rendering a valuable service to students in these straitened times.

The Vulgate Text of Ezra, Nehemiah, Tobit and Judith. The great Benedictine edition of the Vulgate makes steady progress, and the eighth volume has now appeared.[1] This includes the text of the two books of Ezra (*i.e.*, Ezra and Nehemiah), Tobit and Judith, beautifully printed on quarto pages, with full critical apparatus, in which account is taken of the important manuscripts of the text and of the principal printed editions down to the Clementine. This is the first time any such edition has been published, and it is comparable in importance with the Cambridge edition of the Septuagint which was begun by Brooke and McLean. A brief introduction gives some account of the manuscripts used in the preparation of the present volume. The exacting, but unexciting, work which goes into such an edition renders a very high service to Biblical scholarship, and this edition is an indispensable tool for all text-critical work.

Founders of Religions. Professor H. J. Schoeps, who has recently published in rapid succession two books dealing with Jewish Christianity, has now published a small book giving an account of the founders of several of the world's religions and of their teaching.[2] The persons dealt with are Moses, Jesus, Marcion and Mani, Muhammad, Zoroaster, Buddha, Lao-tzŭ and Confucius. While there is much that is useful in the volume, and the unusual inclusion of Marcion and Mani will give it a special place among such books, there are some things that cannot be trusted. The author states that Moses was born at the beginning of the fourteenth century B.C., thus placing him, without the slightest explanation or justification, in a century to which no one who has studied the question would ascribe him. Worse still, Rameses II is placed in that century, with complete disregard of the work of Egyptologists and ancient chronologers. The traditional date for Lao-tzŭ is accepted without the slightest hint that it is widely challenged amongst Chinese scholars to-day, or that Lao-tzŭ is by some dissolved into legend. While the book is intended for the general public, it ought not to present improbable or doubtful views in this way. There is a useful table of technical terms, with definitions, at the end of the volume. The Bibliography is almost exclusively German, as may be understood in a work of this kind, and it shows that the author has relied in general on standard works in each section of his field.

The Minor Prophets. Professor J. Coppens is about to publish a new translation of the Minor Prophets together with commentary.[3] He has issued in advance a slender volume containing the Introductions to these books.[4] In but one case do we find more than three pages devoted to a single book, and a large share of this ration is given up to an analysis of the contents of each book. The critical standpoint is adopted throughout. Thus Zechariah is assigned to more than one hand, Joel is located in the post-exilic age, Jonah is treated as a piece of late fiction. Detailed points cannot be dealt with in a work on this scale, but a brief note is added at the end of each section indicating some of the passages which are frequently denied to the prophets in question. At the end there is a Bibliography, from which the reviewer misses Hammershaimb's *Amos*, and Kapelrud's *Joel Studies*. In no case does Professor Coppens appear to favour the view that we have here liturgies coming from the hand of cultic prophets, though he indicates his adhesion to the view that there were cultic prophets in Israel.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester University

[1] *Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam Vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem iussu Pii PP. XII cura et studio Monachorum Abbatiae Pontificiae Sancti Hieronymi in urbe Ordinis Sancti Benedicti edita :* VIII. *Libri Ezrae Tobiae Iudith* [1950]. Vatican Press, Rome ; $4.00.

[2] *Gottheit und Menschheit : die grossen Religionsstifter und ihre Lehren* [1950]. Steingrüben Verlag, Stuttgart ; DM 8.20.

[3] This may perhaps have appeared before this note is published.

[4] *Les douze petits prophètes : Breviaire du Prophétisme* [1950]. Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges and Paris, and Publications Universitaires, Louvain ; Belgian Fr. 35.

Entre Nous

The Approach to Preaching

The Approach to Preaching, by the Rev. W. E. Sangster, M.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press ; 5s. net), contains the substance of lectures on preaching which Dr. Sangster gave to the students of the six Methodist Theological Colleges in England in 1950, during his year as President of the Methodist Conference. In this book Dr. Sangster touches nothing which he does not illumine. In one very

great chapter he writes of what he calls ' The Plus of the Spirit,' that indefinable something which makes a man a great preacher. ' It is not great ability which ultimately subdues men but great goodness.' He tells of Thomas Cook, a nineteenth-century evangelist who seemed to have no outstanding gifts (' He was such an *ordinary* person ') and who yet possessed an extraordinary power.

There is an intensely practical chapter on ' The Husbandry of Time.' John Wesley's first of his twelve rules for his helpers was, ' Be diligent. Never be unemployed. Never be triflingly employed. Never while away time nor spend more time at any given place than is strictly necessary.' Sir Francis Darwin explained the achievement of his father Charles Darwin by saying, ' A striking characteristic was his respect for time ; he never forgot how precious it was. He would often say that saving the minutes was the way to get work done ; he showed his love of saving the minutes in the difference he felt between a quarter of an hour and ten minutes' work.' So Dr. Sangster lays down the law, ' Learn to distinguish between ten minutes and a quarter of an hour.'

' One of the great features of great preachers,' says Dr. Sangster, ' is the skill some men possess to leave people feeling that they have wandered through them with a lighted candle.' Another is a real personal interest in each individual man. Briggs of Harvard had that. ' If you ask an old Harvard man if he knew Briggs the chances are that he will answer : " Did I know him ? I knew him perhaps as nobody else knew him. There was a special bond between us." He is unaware that all the other men are saying the same thing. . . . So rich was his humanity that every one who drew on it felt that he was having it all.' That is a reflection of the love of God ' who loves each one of us as if there was only one of us to love.'

Many of us whose task it is to preach will be humbly thankful and grateful that in this book a master of preaching has shared his mind and his heart and his experiences with us.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Not an End—but a Beginning

' I was born a Jew and grew up a free-thinker, though there was at the back of my mind a constant quest for the eternal truth. In the utter homelessness of exile, I felt the shadow of death near me. There was nothing uncommon in the fact that a man who was spiritually and materially uprooted should long for death. One autumn night during my stay in Budapest I was walking along the broad river Danube. I saw the mist moving upon the dark face of the water. Great fear fell upon me. I was afraid of the future, afraid of man, afraid of the water beneath the embankment, afraid of myself. . . . At that moment I noticed the form of a cross shining clearly through the night, with an aura of blue light around it. What I saw was the illuminated cross above a chapel at the foot of St. Gellert's hill. Suddenly I knew that the way of the Cross leads from death to life, from homelessness to the Father's House, from the terror of sin to repentance, from scepticism to faith. I decided to read the Bible. With heart beating I entered a book shop and asked for the New Testament. With joy and awe I attended divine service, till on Good Friday of the following year I asked the minister of the Scottish Mission to instruct me in the Christian faith. I did not say that I wished to be baptized. I just said that I wished to know something about the Christian faith. As one who has starved for a long time devours the first meal which is set before him, I swallowed the Word of God. At the end of my preparation I felt an urge to confess to my instructor those doubts which had long been besetting me. It was now my greatest desire to be baptized. It was the only possible outcome of my conversion experience that I should receive the outward visible sign of the inward grace which God had wrought in me. Once more I stood beside a broad river. This was not the river of death, but the river of life. Yet I could not see what lay beyond. I was unable to comprehend clearly what it would mean to live the Christian life. Would my life come to a spiritual standstill, or would it go on just in the same manner as before ? Or——? '

' The minister [1] who had led me so far gave the answer : " This is not an end, but a beginning." When towards the end of the Sabbath service, after the Word of God had been proclaimed, I stepped forward and answered the questions which were put before me with a threefold " I do," I was lifted up into a new sphere of life. I felt the water on my head burning like fire while I was borne up by the Benediction in which the congregation joined —" The Lord bless thee, and keep thee. . . ." ' [2]

[1] The Rev. George Knight, B.D., from 1935 to 1940 Head of the Scottish Mission in Budapest, now Professor of Old Testament at Knox College, Dunedin, New Zealand.

[2] Bernhard Citron, *New Birth : A Study of the Evangelical Doctrine of Conversion in the Protestant Fathers*, 124 f.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.